

A FULL  
ANSWER  
TO THAT  
QUESTION

*What is the Church of England?*

WITH A  
Defence and Continuation  
OF THE  
Conforming Non-Conformist, &c.

Wherein the present

CONTROVERSIES

ABOUT

*2d. J. S. of the Au-  
thor's (and misappre-  
hensions)*  
Church-Government and Separation *noti.*

Are further opened and discussed.

By *J. A. C. Lamy.*

*Etiam obiectissimi verba in Ecclesia non contemnenda, sed  
audienda & judicanda sunt. Zuing. in Epist.*

L O N D O N,

Printed by J. M. for J. Robinson at the Golden Lyon  
in St. Pauls Church-yard. 1680.

# ANSWER

TO THAT

## QUESTIONS

Proposed by the Church of England;

and answered by the

General Assembly of the

Church of Scotland;

in the year 1707.



OF THE

CHURCH OF SCOTLAND

AND

CHURCH OF ENGLAND

IN THE YEAR 1707.

AND

ANSWERED BY THE

GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE

CHURCH OF SCOTLAND;

IN THE YEAR 1707.

AND

ANSWERED BY THE



# The Introduction.

**T**Here being left me some room by way of Preface, instead of an Epistle Dedicatory, I will say somewhat here in the beginning concerning the point of Separation, being a Controversie now much agitated, and the scope of my Work well warranting me to deliver my Judgment therein. I will set down my Judgment in the words of that most eminent Man Mr. Joseph Allein in his Cases of Conscience, pag. 52. which I wish all good people wisely to consider, especially they who are addicted to Separation. Some one, I suppose it is Mr. Baxter, hath twice in the margin put N. B. as a token of approbation. The words are these—“We  
“may not think that Gods Ordinances remaining  
“for substance his, may be forsaken, because of  
“some faults of the Administrators, or in the way  
“of their Administration. The administering of  
“Gods Ordinances belongs not to the People, but  
“to the Minister. And if he fail in his duty by  
“administering them in a way that is not fit, and  
“is less edifying, it is my grief, but his sin. N. B.  
“Hophni and Phinehas were corrupt in their lives,  
“and brought in much corruption and rudeness into  
“the Service of God: yet Elkanah and Hannah  
“with others of the godly, did nevertheless attend  
“Gods Worship and Sanctuary, 1 Sam. 1. 2. Much  
“corruption was crept in both into the Doctrine and  
“Worship

## The Introduction.

"Worship and lives of the Administrators in the  
 "Church of the Jews: yet our Saviour (though he  
 "still cryed down the corruptions: (N. B.) and would  
 "not join in them) never prohibited Communion with  
 "them in Gods Worship; but enjoyns it, Mat. 5. 24.  
 "Mar. 1. 44. Luk. 5. 14. and practises it, both he,  
 "his Parents and Apostles, Luk. 2. 21, 22, 34, 39,  
 "41, 42, 46. Act. 21. 23, 24, 26. So far be.  
 "With this I do fully concur.

"I will add hereto the Judgment of Mr. Robert  
 Bolton in his Saints sure and perpetual Guide.  
 It is true he was a Conformist, but the Non-confor-  
 mist will acknowledge him to have been a Man emi-  
 nent for Learning, Piety, and Ministerial Wisdom,  
 Soundness, and Fidelity. Pag. 61. "A sixth lett  
 "and hinderance from hearing the Word of God, are  
 "certain prophane and unwarrantable Perswasions  
 "and Concesses, which are entertained and harboured  
 "in the hearts of ignorant and wilful people. Pag. 71.  
 "Object. 7. I, but (will some say) this Word is  
 "brought unto us by weak and frail men; sometimes  
 "by those who are of notorious and infamous life  
 "and conversation: and therefore we have less heart  
 "to believe and obey them. Pag. 73. Besides com-  
 "mon frailty and infirmity, the Minister and Mes-  
 "senger of the Word is of lewd and prophane life and  
 "conversation. If he be, more is the pity; the scan-  
 "dal of the Ministry is the greater, and his own  
 "damnation more smarting and terrible. See Psal.  
 "50. 16, 17, &c. But notwithstanding, the pro-  
 "phaneness of the Preacher is no priviledge to the  
 "Hearer, either of negligence or disobedience. He  
 "that turns his ear from hearing of the Law  
 "truly preached (though by a Pharisee) even his  
 "prayer

## The Introduction.

"prayer is abominable, Prov. 28. 9. He that  
 "despise the word shall be destroyed, Prov.  
 "13. 13. He that obeyeth not the Son in his Mi-  
 "nist'rs, lawfully sent, though not sanctified them-  
 "selves, shall not see life, but the wrath of God  
 "abideth on him, Joh. 3. 36. Christ himself, in the  
 "Gospel, bids his Followers to observe and do what-  
 "soever they were bid by the Scribes and Pharisees,  
 "which sat in Moses Chair, but not to do after  
 "their works; for they said and did not, Mat. 23.  
 "2, 3. Every Minister is to be heard, received,  
 "and followed, so far as he follows and delivers up  
 "the Church the Truth of God, and Doctrine of the  
 "Apostles. For therein he is an Angel of the Lord  
 "of Hosts, and Ambassadors in the stead of  
 "Christ, Mal. 2. 7. 2 Cor. 5. 21. And all the  
 "parts of the Ministry in his hand (he following the  
 "Word) shall as certainly be accomplished, as if an  
 "Angel, or Christ from Heaven should presently and  
 "potently execute them. See Eccles. 37. 18. If  
 "he denounce Judgments against sin, it is as if the  
 "voice of God himself should be heard from Heaven;  
 "as if the Lion of the Tribe of Judah should roar. If  
 "he pour the oyl of comfort into a wounded and  
 "distressed Conscience, it is as sure and certain, as soft  
 "and sweet to the believing Soul, as if the Angels  
 "should comfort him, as they did Christ in his Ago-  
 "ny, Luk. 22. 43. or as if Christ himself should mag-  
 "nificently reach out his glorious hand through the  
 "Clouds, and bind up his broken heart and bruised  
 "conscience with a plaster of his own precious Blood.  
 "If he instruct, admonish, reprove, exhort, persuade  
 "from ground and warrant out of the Word, it is all  
 "one as if Christ himself should do it: who hath said,  
 "He

## The Introduction.

He that heareth you, heareth me, Luke 10. 16.  
 Let men therefore pretend what they will; if they  
 will not bear, beseise, and obey the Lord, speaking  
 in the Ministry of the Word, though the means and  
 Messengers be never so base and vile, frail, weak  
 and sinful; let an Angel come from Heaven, a  
 Devil from Hell, or a man from the dead; yet  
 would they not believe. For, if a man were truly  
 humbled, he would tremble at Gods Word, of whom  
 soever he heard it. If he had a spiritual taste,  
 he would relish the heavenly food, whosoever mini-  
 stered it. If he had Gods ho'y Spirit, he would  
 know and acknowledge Gods Sword, which is the  
 Word of God, in whose hand soever he saw it. And  
 until he have this Spirit, a spiritual taste, and an  
 humble heart, he will not believe, especially with  
 effect, fruit, and practice, let him pretend what-  
 soever he will, neither Angels, nor men; dead,  
 nor living; Moses, nor the Prophets, Peter, nor  
 Paul; not Christ, nor God himself; if the one were  
 living again upon Earth, or the other would be plea-  
 sed, or it were possible, to speak immediately to him.  
 Pag. 126. Which course of separating from, and  
 condemning our Church, in the Judgment of our  
 sincerest Divines, is full of pride, contention, and  
 confusion. And he lays down five weighty Reasons,  
 and concludes — "I'll do they then, who trans-  
 ported with a pang of spiritual pride, abandon,  
 forsake, and separate from our Church, as though  
 Gods true Worship and Salvation were not there to  
 be found. Pag. 127. Thus far he.

For mine own part this is my Judgment. If I be  
 Minister of a Parish, and the Church is large enough  
 to hold all the people, and a Non-conforming Mini-  
 ster

## The Injunction.

ster shall set up a Meeting, and preach at the same time: neither will I upbraid it, nor will I open my mouth against it, unless constrained by such necessity as I cannot avoid; and even then I will do it with all just mildness and caution. I will rejoice if Christ be preached, and go down upon my knees to the Magistrate that he will do no violence to them, but rather let them peaceably meet and take their own way. And I will warn and counsel my people, if you can better profit by his Ministry than mine, go to him, and Gods blessing be with you. I seek not yours, but you: only take heed and beware that you do what which all things considered, makes best for your Soul, and which may be a pattern for others to follow.

If the Church will not hold all the people, and there be no other godly Conforming Church near to which they can conveniently resort, and edifie their Souls; then I will be glad and thankful for the assistance of a Non conforming Minister in any convenient place within the Parish, at the same time: and let him take his own way as he sees good. And if he do part of the work, he shall have part of the wages: and between us we will look to the whole Flock, and unite and converse together as dear Brethren: if it cannot be obtained at the Magistrates hands to open the door of Conformity wider, for the letting in of conscientious Dissenters, which is greatly to be wished, and the Minister be such as a godly man may profit by. If the Conforming Churches will well hold all the people, then if the Non conforming Minister shall preach at any other time, whether before or after, a godly prudence shall direct, I will come again, and join with him my self; and encourage others so to do, where I can discern the people can well bear it.



## The Introduction.

two Sermons on a Lords day: or if he preach upon the week day, when there is no preaching in the public place, I will come hear him: and either he shall share with me in the maintenance, or I will contribute according to my ability and his endeavours for his pains within the bounds of my Parish.

The Non-conformists stand bound to preach Christs Gospel, and exercise their Ministry, where they shall have just call, though prohibited by men. What is a just call themselves must be Judges of, as to their own acts and duty, and so far as they are accountable to God: yet must they judge rightly, and for that end use good advice. And where godly prudence shall dictate to them that prohibic & nunc, it is their duty to forbear, they are to forbear. In cases prudential the wisest may miss it of meer ignorance and simplicity, which in many cases is almost laudable and no error. And men of holy minds and tender consciences are more apt of the two to erre on the better hand. There is as true need of preaching Christs Gospel now, and as being instant in season, out of season, as was in the time of Christ and his Apostles. And an ordinary Commission from Christ, which the Non-conformists and all just ordained Ministers have, doth warrant the preaching of Gods Word in needy places, though the Magistrate forbid, no just impediment being in the way: as truly as an extraordinary and immediate Commission from God. Those Non-conformists who have a wife and children, and a constant charge lying upon them, and nothing to live on but the Ministry, and even all that be unwarranted, seem to be under a double necessity of preaching: the one as principal, the other as subordinate, unless the Bishops, or the Magistrate, or any other will free them from this latter necessity by freeing

## The Introduction.

fraying them from their wants; for they ought not to have been cast out. Outward maintenance is too low a thing to be the main and principal reason of a Minister's preaching; but it may be an honest lower subordinate motive; where a more principal motive prevails and goes before. I conceive that where God doth make a difference, there may we. Now God doth make a difference between the Ministry of the best and the worst, between the Ministry of a John Baptist and a Pharisee; a living man and an image. It is the Magistrates sin that he doth not countenance and protect the good and well deserving, and honour those whom God doth honour. If the Magistrate will not do his duty, the people must do theirs. And wise and faithful Pastors must consult the interest of the Church and the good of Souls. To my remembrance Mr. Baxter adviseth persons in his Book for Families ordinarily to receive the Sacrament in their own Parish, though they go to hear a more blessing Ministry. If I were a private Christian, and the Minister of my Parish should be a Pharisee, and the Minister of the next Parish should be a John Baptist, I would do my endeavour to hear them both. If I could I would remove my dwelling and Family, and sit wholly under the Ministry of John Baptist, yet going no further from the Ministry of the Pharisee in my heart than Christ doth warrant me. But some can neither travel, nor remove their dwellings: but all are to be wise for their Souls: and if they sit under the Ministry of a Pharisee, or one that is scandalous, it is to be with great grief, they must be the more watchful, and be glad of better means when they can get them, and not judge those that out of conscience go to hear better means. There are some Non-conformists who by fa-

your

## The Introduction.

know and conscience do preach in Churches or Chapels. And are they self-denying Pastors and Lovers of Souls that envy them such liberty? Nay for mine own part, if the Conforming Minister shall be grossly scandalous and insufficient, and a conscientious Non-conformist shall preach within the Parish at the same time, I dare not say that this is unparratable Separation. I do rather think it to be just and parratable. My reason is this. Such a Minister should be deposed, and a better put in his room. If that cannot be done, there lyes an obligation upon the people to turn from him to a godly Ministry, if there be any at hand. By thus doing I do not go before God; but I follow him. Where God doth make a difference, there may we. Under the Law the people were bound by Divine command to offer Sacrifice at one place, and so they must either go to the Ministry of Hophni and Phinehas, or totally keep at home, which latter they might not do. But when Christ and John Baptist appeared, the people flocked after them: this was no unjust Separation. Though Christ be not now upon Earth personally, he dwells in all his faithful Ministers and People by his Spirit. And where the carcass is, thither will the Eagles be gathered together. I grant it is the peoples sin that they do not profit by the worst Ministry. But the question is not what is the disease, but what is the remedy. And no man can deny but that the Ministry of a skilful, holy, self-denying, painful Pastor is more likely to be blessed of God to the good of Souls, than the Ministry of an ignorant, unholy, self-seeking, and lazy Pastor. Object. This Principle granted will infer endless Separations, no man can tell where the stop shall be. Answer. This Principle will produce thus much, that every man is

## The Introduction.

to be wise for his Soul, and prefer the publick good before his own private good, and where the Law and Magistracy are against faithfull men, faithfull men must do as they can. If they erre of frailty, God will forgive them. This Principle will lead people to these two things. 1. Not to despise the Ministry of the worst, so far as he is by office and calling a Minister outwardly, and dispenseth Gods Word and Ordinances, but to attend it thankfully when God makes it his duty to be under it. 2. To difference between Ministry and Ministry, to difference where God doth difference, and to shew it by word and practice as well as by inward esteem, avoiding by paths on either hand, and in evil contentions and divided times to be wise as the Serpene, and innocent as the dove. When the Non-conformists conceive themselves to be under a tie to preach and exercise their Ministry at the same time, I propose this to them, if they do not lie under an obligation to do so much in Conformity as themselves grant to be lawful. I know some very eminent Non-conformists that do read some Common Prayer ordinarily. And the truth is, many godly people of England go too far from many things in Conformity, and will not endure their separating Principles and Practices to be fully, plainly, and impartially spoken against. I know it by experience. And I do know no small number of very sincere, humble, charitable, experienced, impartial, godly private Christians, who abide under a negligent and scandalous Ministry, having none other to whom they can conveniently go. And I know many holy Non-conformists, who think it their duty to forbear preaching at the same time in Blessings of their own, though the Parish Ministry be the so and so.

# The CONTENTS.

**T**HE present Controversie concerning Separation  
spoken to in the Introduction.

What is the Church of England? answered, pag. 1.

The Answer vindicated from Exceptions by Mr.  
Baxter on the one hand, p. 4, 5. and by the Church-  
men on the other hand, p. 37.

An assertion of Mr. Baxters with others, that parti-  
cular Churches are part of the universal, as a Troop  
is of an Army, or a City of a Kingdom, refuted,  
p. 15.

An Argument by Mr. Hudson and Mr. Calamy  
for it answered, p. 20.

Ad hominem by Mr. Baxters reasoning, it putteth  
down all the Parish-churches and Pastors, and set-  
teth up a Pope as Head under Christ over all the  
Churches, p. 92.

In the Judgment of Mr. T. Hooker and the New-  
England Divines it is a Popish Tenent in a Prote-  
stant dress, p. 94.

The division of the Church into universal and parti-  
cular not good, p. 196, 223, 224.

Mr. Baxters definition of the Church universal fault-  
y in two points, p. 21, 22, 23.

A dangerous assertion of his, That Christ hath insti-  
tuted two essentially different Church-forms never to  
be altered by man: it subverteth the Church and  
Religion, ib. & p. 96, 225.

His censure of the State of the Church Universal about  
three hundred, four hundred, and five hundred  
years after Christ, p. 49.



## The Contents.

His assertion, That all Ministers are to be Independent, and learn of one another as equals in Office, though not equals in Gifts, refused, p. 27.

The English Episcopacy proved to stand by a threefold cord, its own goodness and usefulness, prescription, and the municipal Laws of the Land. Mr. B. confuted by Mr. B. St. Jerome confuted by St. Jerome, a passage of Mr. Hales against Episcopacy answered, with the objections of some others, from p. 27. to p. 77.

A short passage of Mr. T. Hooker against Surrogates, Chancellors, Deans, Archdeacons, p. 77. These Offices opened and vindicated, and something spoken concerning Pluralities and Non-residency, and the way of chusing Ministers in England, from p. 77. to p. 92. For Chancellors see also p. 44, 45, 46, 47, 48. out of Mr. B.

Mr. Baxters way of Church covenanting proved to be the same with that of the Independents, p. 96. to 101.

Twenty Reasons against it, and Objections answered.

In the judgment of Mr. Rutherford it is damnable will-worship, and the making of a new Gospel. Mr. B. lays the concord of all the Churches upon it. J. C.'s zealous protestation against it. J. C. gives no more to the Magistrate in the placing of Ministers than Mr. B. doth. A passage of J. C. severely taxed by Mr. B. touching peoples not receiving of faithful Ministers placed by the Magistrate, explained and vindicated. Mr. B. not consistent to himself in the practice of his Church-covenant at Kederminster, from p. 101. to p. 155.

Mr. Baxters and the Independents description of a particular Church agreeeth to a Diocess, a Province,

## The Contents.

A Nation, yea to the whole Christian World, no man can tell one Church from another by it, they make new Forms of Churches never made by God, and a new Essential of Church communion, p. 150, 151, 152, 223.

How far Mr. Z. Cawdrey is for a mutual Covenant between Pastor and People, his way is quite different from Mr. Baxters and the Independents, p. 131. His utter dislike of the Independent way, p. 224, 225.

The case of Ministers Conformity further argued with Mr. B. from p. 156. to the end of the Book.

The present Conformity doth not look upon Presbyterian Ordination to be a Nullity, proved p. 159.

Ministers Presbyterially ordained may without sin, in case of deprivation, be Episcopally ordained, p. 162.

Mr. Alsop convicted of error and uncharitableness, p. 165, 166. His own words retorted upon him. J. C.'s esteem of him, and friendly advice to him, from p. 251. to p. 254.

Concerning the distinction between Bishops and Presbyters, whether two Orders, p. 167.

Of the Bishops Oath to the Archbishop, ibid.

Of the Oath or promise of obedience to the Ordinary and the Church-canon, p. 168.

Of these words, Receive the Holy Ghost, p. 169.

Of the Election of Bishops, p. 170.

Of Athanasius's Creed, p. 171.

Of the state of baptized Infants, of right to Sacraments, and of Godfathers. Mr. Baxters Standard of admission to Sacraments proved faulty. The unregenerate may receive the Sacrament. It is less sin to receive than not to receive, from p. 171 to p. 188, and again from p. 230. to 251.

Touching

## The Contents.

- Touching our hope of the dead, p. 189.
- Touching Confirmation, p. 190.
- Of the Cross in Baptism. Mr. Baxter overcome by his own concessions, p. 192.
- Concerning the lesser Excommunication, and the Bishops way of Discipline: more also of right to Sacraments. Mr. B. must be silenced by his own Doctrine. No man more zealous for Christ's Discipline than he: no man more against it. He justifies the way of our first Reformers, and shakes the cause of the Covenanters and Disciplinarians. This from p. 195. to p. 207.
- The Act for Uniformity no part of the Common-Prayer Book. Mr. B. overcome of his own concessions, p. 207.
- Concerning the Solemn League and Covenant. One word retracted of what Mr. B. advised and no more, p. 209, 210.
- A word to those over-zealous Brethren which say, The Covenant was the greatest tye to Unity, and the best expedient for Reformation, p. 221.
- The Presbyterians and Independents as bitter against one another, as the Prelates were against both, opened and proved with sorrow of heart, from p. 215. to p. 221.
- The Catholicon vindicated. Mr. Baxters concessions about it. Its usefulness, p. 212.
- Of the Rule about Easter, p. 214.
- Of taking Arms against the Kings Commissioners, ibid.
- Whether Dr. Raynolds and Mr. Knewstubs were Conformists, p. 215.
- Pastor and People granted to be a Church as well before and after assembling, as during the Assembly, p. 222.
- J. C's

## The Contents.

J. C's Answer to the charge or suspicion of worldliness, p. 128. and to his change of judgment in some things, p. 229.

Gods assenting to the use of mens sins, though not to the sins themselves, retracted: as also my ignorant conjecture, that there was no Competitor at Mr. Baxters place, and the misdistribution of the divers Orders in the Ministry, p. 228, 251.

We may not consent to the least sin. A doubtful evil may be done to avoid a known evil. Of two sins neither is to be chosen. In what sense Oaths are stricti juris, p. 156, 157, 158. The Covenanters have reason to be charitable to the Conformists for subscribing some things in a sense varying from the precise letter, p. 159.

A concluding Speech to Mr. Baxter, p. 254.

A N

# ANSWER TO THAT QUESTION

*What is the Church of England?*

**T**HE Church of *England* I conceive to be all the faithful Ministers and People of *England*. The Lord Jesus Christ is the head thereof. For he is said to be the head of every man, 1 Cor. ii. 3, and to be the head over all things to the Church, which is his body, Eph. i. 22, 23. Such as be Hypocrites and false professors, both Ministers and People, are as Tares among the Wheat. The King is King and supreme Governour *circa sacra*, as was David, Solomon, and the rest of the Kings of *Judah*. The Parish-Ministers are incumbent fixed Pastors to the Christian souls in their Parishes respectively. The Bishops by office are Episcopal Visitors and superintendents over the Pastors and Churches in their several Diocesses, placed by the Magistrate, being in a limited and sound sense, *Episcopi pascunt*. The Chancellors are joyned to them as

B Officials,



Officials, Assistants and Civil Visiters; they are ~~not~~ Episcopal Visiters, nor have they the intrinsic power of a Minister, but are appointed by the King to exercise so much jurisdiction in Causes Ecclesiastical as he can justly delegate. The Arch-bishop of *York* is Chief or Foreman of all the Bishops within the Province of *York*. The Arch-bishop of *Canterbury* is Chief or Foreman of all the Bishops within the Province of *Canterbury*, and is elder Brother to the Arch-bishop of *York*. The two Houses of Convocation are a competent number of Bishops and principal Divines chosen out of all the Diocesses in *England*, Assembled together for consultation about the affairs of the Church, by the appointment of the King. Their determinations being godly and profitable for the Church, have a threefold obligation, 1. To the goodness of the things themselves decreed, which may commend them to every wise and good man. 2. The joint and several Authority of the persons by whom the decrees are made, being chief Ministers in Gods Church, and Stewards and Embassadors of Christ. 3. The extrensic Law and Sanction of the Magistrate, and if the things decreed be simply evil, no man is to do them. If they be but inconvenient, a wise and peaceable and Conscientious Man is to do them. The Parliament is a mixt Assembly, consisting of Bishops, Lords, and Commons, under and together with the King, and is the Supream judicature of the Kingdom, from which there lyes no appeal save to God. The Bible is the Religion of the Church of *England*. The Thirty nine Articles, the Homilies, the Common-Prayer Book,

Book, and Church Canons, are subordinate Explanations, Sermons, Commentaries, Rules, Forms, Appointments and Observances, Consulted and Enacted, as meet to be observed by the Clergy and People of *England*, and supposed in nothing repugnant to the word of God. The Conformable Clergie are judged by the Magistrate *ceteris paribus* to be most worthy of his Countenance and Protection. The several Congregations and Assemblies, of Pastors and People throughout the Kingdom, are not limbs and parcels of a Church, but they are so many Churches and decent orderly Societies of Christians, consisting of a Pastor governing, and People governed, joyning together in Publick Worship. It is called the Church of *England* in such sort as all the Christian Pastors and People throughout the world, are by Divines generally called the Universal Church. If it be no incongruity to call all the Christian Pastors and People throughout the world, one Church, and the Church Universal, of which Christ is the head in a transcendent sense, and so as none other is nor can be; then I do not see but that it is as proper to call all the Christian Pastors and People of *England* by the name of one Church, and the Church of *England*, or the Church of God in *England*. There is nothing more ordinary with Divines than these terms, *The Universal Church*; and we say in our common Creed, *The holy Catholick Church*, meaning thereby all the Faithful Pastors and People up and down the world. In like sort say I, all the Faithful People and Pastors in *England*, may be said to be the Church

of *England*, or the Church of God in *England*, and with them there may be multitudes of Hypocrites and false Professors as there was a *Judas* among the Apostles, a *Cham* in *Noah's* Ark, five Foolish Virgins with the Wife, and Tares mingled with the Wheat.

*Obj.* By the same reason that you call all the Christians Pastors and People, and all the Churches or Congregations in *England*, by the name of the Church of *England*, you may call all the Scholars and Schoolmasters, and all the Schools in *England*, The School of *England*. So *Mr. Baxter* argues. *Ans.* How then do you Answer this? You do well allow all the Faithful Pastors and People throughout the world to be called one Church, and the Church Universal. May we with as good reason say, that all the Schoolmasters and Scholars throughout the world do make one School, and may we call them the Universal School? If you allow this Phrase, The Universal Church, meaning thereby all the faithful Pastors and People throughout the world; with what reason can you except against this Phrase, The Church of *England*, as comprehending all the Faithful Pastors and People of *England*? The Church is a heavenly School, Grammar Schools are worldly Schools. Grammar Schools may be among Pagans, the Church can be only of Christians. The Church is a spiritual Society, and is more one than Soul and Body are one. Worldly Schools have not those bands of Union and spiritual coagmentation which the Church and Christians have.

Saith

Saith Mr. Baxter in his *Ecclesiastical Cases*,  
*Quest. 57. pag. 131.* "In these three senses I  
 "confess a National Church. 1. As all the  
 "Christians in a Nation are under one Civil  
 "Church Governour. 2. As they are consoci-  
 "ated for concord, and meet in Synods, or hold  
 "correspondencies. 3. As they are all a part of the  
 "Universal Church, cohabiting in one Nation.  
 "But all these are equivocal uses of the word  
 "*Church*; the denomination being taken in the  
 "first from an accident; in the second the name  
 "of a policy being given to a community agree-  
 "ing for concord; in the third, the name of the  
 "whole is given to a small integral part. I will  
 crave leave to Animadvert upon this a little with  
 respect to the present point. The Church of  
*England* is not denominated from an accident.  
 The King is a member of the Church of *England*,  
 he must needs be so because he is a Christian. If  
 he were no Christian he would be King, but he  
 could not be *intra Ecclesiam* within the Church.  
 That which we call the Church of *England*, is  
 constituted of none but Church-members, Chri-  
 stian Pastors, and Christian People, and so the  
 King being a Christian he is one of this same So-  
 ciety; he is neither a common Christian, nor is  
 he a proper Pastor, but he is a Christian King,  
 and consequently a Christian, and it is his being  
 a Christian which gives him standing in the  
 Church together with other Christians. But  
 Mr. Baxter saith, *ib. pag. 132.* That from the visi-  
 ble constitution of the Church of *England*, it is pro-  
 ved, That there is (besides the King) no distinct  
 Ecclesiastical head. For the Arch Bishop of Can-  
 B 3 terbury

sol.
 terbury is not the proper Governour of the Arch-Bishop of York and his Province. To which answer, That no such thing is or can be proved: It is Christ Jesus who is head of the Church of England, and of all the Christian Pastors and People therein, and under Christ all the Parish-Ministers are subordinate guides and rulers of their Flocks respectively. The Arch-Bishop of Canterbury doth neither claim the office and prerogative of Christ, nor doth he put down all the Bishops and Pastors within his Province. But the Parish-Ministers and Presbyters are true and just Pastors and Rulers over their Flocks; they are not the Bishops or Arch-Bishops Bailiffs and Deputies, but they are the Embassadors of Christ, and have lawful pastoral power, sufficient for the edification of themselves and their flocks, if they be not wanting to themselves, without damage to any side. The Bishops are general Officers, Overseers, and Superintendents, and the Arch-Bishop is not *primus Pastorum*, Foreman of all the Parish Pastors or Presbyters, but *primus Episcoporum*, Foreman of all the Diocesan Visitors, and Super-intendents. And this is the genuine frame of the English Episcopacy. It is the absolute incommunicable right of Jesus Christ to be the head of every man, and of every Society and combination, and all that are Christians do so acknowledge him, and consequently he is the sole transcendent governing head of the Church of England; all be under him. But he makes use of subordinate Officers in his Church, not one, nor two, but a multitude. And so there are in the Church of England, besides the two Arch-



Arch-Bishops, a multitude of Christian Pastors and spiritual Overseers, some are as Colonels of Regiments, others as Captains of single Troops; the body is but one, the members are many; some are governing guiding Members, some are governed guided Members. But Christ is head over all, and the common center of all. None may invade his Office. And it is a slander to say, that the Bishops or Arch-Bishops do take themselves to be sole Pastors to all the Christian Souls in *England*. As the Church of *England* is not denominatd from an accident, so neither is it denominatd from a Synod. This Mr. Baxter, in pag. 132. proves from the *English Church Canons*, Canon 139. The Canon it self ascribes no more to the National Synod but to be the Church representative. As the Parliament is not the Kingdom of *England*, so neither is the National Synod or Convocation the Church of *England*. This makes for my description of the Church of *England*, as consisting of all the Christian Pastors and People in *England*. So that the Church of *England*, and the National Synod of *England* are not the same. The national Synod is but an occasional contingent Assembly, the Members thereof are but a handful, both before the Synod, during the Synod, and after the Synod. The Church of *England* is not the national Synod of *England*, nor is the national Synod the Church of *England*. The members of the Synod, are members of the Church of *England*, but they are not it it self, save by representation only, as that fore-cited Canon intimates. The Bishops and Clergy in Convocation do not take themselves

to be the sole governours of the Church of *England* under Christ, but only a just and lawful Synod, or Convocation of Bishops and principal Divines, called forth of all the Diocesses of *England*, and meeting in one Assembly as the Representatives and Delegates of the several Churches, by the appointment of the Magistrate. Now saith *Mr. Baxter*, this Synod or Assembly of Bishops and principal Divines in Convocation, *is not a Policy, but a Community agreeing for Concord.* Call it what you will, it is a just and orderly Synod, it is a Synod of Ministers and not of private Christians who have no Office in the Church; yea it is a Synod of principal Ministers, and of the chief Heads and Fathers of the Church; yea it is a Synod of Delegates and Representatives, either chosen by the particular votes and suffrage of the Churches, or chosen and appointed by the Magistrate as a nursing Father to the Church. So that look what Authority the several Ministers, Divines, and Members of the Synod had out of Synod, that they have in Synod to the full. If they have not more, be sure they have not less. He that is a Minister out of Synod, doth not cease to be a Minister in Synod. I will easily grant that if they had no Authority out of Synod, their bare Assembling together in one place could not give them Authority. As suppose twenty dead men, lying in twenty several Countries, should all be brought together in one place, they cannot by all their wits put together, make one living man; and so let twenty Brethren, Sons of the same Father, meet in one Assembly or Consecration, they cannot by all their force united  
and

and put together make one Father. But if twenty Justices of Peace shall meet together in Sessions, they have more Power and greater Authority in Sessions than they would have had out; the reason is, because that which doth constitute them Justices, doth limit the exercise of their power, and appoints such and such things to be done not by a single Justice, but by two at least, whereof one shall be of the *Quorum*; and other particular things not to be done save in Sessions time. I shall not deny but that there may be a difference between worldly Policies and Government coercive, respecting Civil matters and outward quiet, and Church government which is conversant about things Sacred, and which do more nearly concern the Soul. It is certain that no man nor number of men can have any Authority against Christ; and it is as certain that good Counsel is its own Law, it standeth by the Divine Authority, and cometh from God as all good things do, whoever is the speaker or bringer. Therefore *David* blessed God for the good counsel of *Abigail*, a Woman: and the Scripture brandeth *Balaam* for not hearkning to the voice of his Ase. He is an ungodly man that stops his ear against godly counsel. And also he is ungodly that chuseth rather to sin than to suffer, and will hearken to a mortal man, or number of men, rather than to the living God. So that all both Persons and Associations of persons greater or smaller, have but a bounded limited Office, Jurisdiction and Authority. But now in a Christian Kingdom or Nation it is necessary that there be order and unity. For a Kingdom

divided

divided against it self cannot stand. Besides the common uniting bands of Christianity, there must be some subservient National Bands. I say subservient. A Christian nation must besides the general Laws, Rules and principles of Christianity, have some subservient national observances for the prevention of those inconveniencies which otherwise will necessarily grow if all be left to their liberty. If it shall be left to every single Minister to Ordain Ministers at his pleasure, how inconvenient would it be? Though all Pastors are Pastors, yet all Pastors have not equal gifts, and graces, and wisdom to do the Pastoral office well and faithfully. It is of the Law of Nature that the best be best esteemed, and that the younger do reverence the elder, and that the unwise and ignorant do learn of the wise and knowing, and that we follow Peace with all men, and Holiness without which no man shall see God, and that we give no offence to Jew nor Gentile nor to the Church of God.

The Magistrate being *custos universae civitatis*, and a Nursing Father to the Church, it behoves him to devise and consult the best way he can how to govern his Realm as a Christian Realm, that his Subjects under him may lead quiet and peaceable lives in all godliness and honesty. Now when he shall Assemble a National Synod of principall Divines out of all the Counties of England, their Authority for order, quiet, and concord sake is much to be regarded; and having the Magistrates sanction, all the Pastors and People in the Kingdom are bound to owe them for a just and

and lawful National Synod, and their Counsels, Canons, Determinations and Agreements being in nothing repugnant to the word of God, are to be submitted to by every Pious and peaceable man. Hereby the just constitution, guidance and order of the Parish Churches, and the Office and Authority of the Stated Pastors and incumbent Ministers of every single Congregation is not nullified and invaded, but rather secured. If in some things it be burdened, it is a thing incident to all Societies and Governments, while in this world; while the foundation is sound, and the main substantials of holiness are saved; and the Presbyters and parochial Ministers and pastors in Ordinary have scope and liberty substantially to edifie and watch over their Flocks, if they will but wisely and faithfully bestir themselves, and make use of that power and liberty which the Law doth allow them, and which they may exercise with the countenance of the Magistrate, we are to bear with many lesser inconveniencies and tolerable evils, and bless God and be thankful for such a Government.

I will now come to Mr. Baxters third sense, in which he owns a national Church, and that is, *as all the Christians in a Nation are a part of the Universal Church, cohabiting in one Nation.* But this, he says, is to give the name of the whole, to a small integral part. Whereto I answer, That this is but to speak the common language of all people, as in saying the *British Sea*, the *Irish Sea*, the *German Sea*, they do not hereby mean the main Ocean, or the whole Sea. The *British Sea* is rightly so-called, and yet it is not the whole Sea.

Either



Either you must forsake the common language of all the Churches, and alter the terms of our Creed, or you will hardly be able to fasten the least impropriety upon this phrase, *The Church of England*, meaning thereby all the Christian pastors and people of *England*. Let us carefully observe the Scripture in this point, *Isa. 4. 5. The Lord will create upon every dwelling place of mount Zion, and upon her assemblies, &c.* Here are two terms, and two distinct matters imported by those terms. 1. Here is mount *Zion*. 2. Here is every dwelling place of mount *Zion*, and her assemblies. Now say I, *England* is a Christian Nation, and so it is another mount *Zion*, or Church of God. Yet is this one mount *Zion*, or Church of God many Assemblies. Every one of these Assemblies is a Church of God, or a sacred Synagogue, or Christian Oratory. *Psal. 74. 8. They have burnt up all the Synagogues of God in the land. Mar. 1. 39. Christ Preached in their Synagogues throughout Galilee. Lev. 26. 31. I will bring your Sanctuaries into desolation. Jer. 51. 51. Strangers are come into the Sanctuaries of the Lord.* So that it is clear the Jews Commonwealth did consist of many Assemblies, Synagogues, and Sanctuaries, these were as so many Churches, or Sacred Conventions of heavenly worshippers, consisting of two parts, a guiding and a guided part. Christ did not come to take down the outward frame and order of the Jewish Synagogues and Sanctuaries, but only to abolish the partition wall between Jew and Gentile, and to Christianize their Synagogues and Sanctuaries, by making the Pastors Christian Pastors, and the

the People Christian People, which is done by Baptism, and the belief, profession and practice of the Christian Faith and principles, without any change at all of the outward frame, constitution, and order of their Synagogues and Sanctuaries convenient for resort all the land over. On the other hand all the godly Pastors and People of Israel were one mount Zion. The Lord bleſs thee, O habitation of justice, and mountain of holiness, Jer. 31. 23. Do good in thy good pleasure unto Zion, Psal. 51. 18. God will save Zion, Psal. 69. 35. For Zions sake I will not hold my Peace, Isa. 62. 1. And the New Testament retaineth the same language. The Churches of Galatia, Gal. 1. 2. the Churches of Judea, v. 22. The seven Churches which are in Asia, Rev. 1. 4. and yet these are but one Israel of God, Gal. 6. 16. By one spirit we are baptized into one body, 1 Cor. 12. 13. many Churches, and yet but one body. Jerusalem which is above, is the mother of us all, Gal. 4. 26. Ye are come unto mount Zion, and unto the City of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, to the general assembly and Church of the first-born, which are written in Heaven, Heb. 12. 22, 23. I will shew thee the Bride, the Lambs Wife, the great City, the holy Jerusalem, descending out of Heaven from God, Rev. 21. 9, 10. Give no offence to the Church of God, 1 Cor. 10. 32. Now what is the meaning of all these places, but plainly this, that all the faithful up and down the world do make one heavenly City, one Israel of God, one heavenly Jerusalem, one Church of the first-born written in Heaven, one body and spouse of the Lord Jesus Christ? So that Gods Church on earth is

many

many assemblies and yet but one Assembly, many Churches and yet but one Church, many habitations and yet but one Habitation. God hath his Zion in *England*, and his Zion in *Scotland* and *Ireland*, and in all other Christian Realms and Kingdoms. All the faithful Ministers and People in *England* are a heavenly Zion and Jerusalem, they are in a sound and proper sense the Church of God in *England*. Accordingly you may observe the common language of all good Ministers and People among us, do they not pray for the Church of God in *England*? Is it not ordinary for those of the Independent and Presbyterian perswasion, and such as are called Dissenters from the Church of *England*, to pray for Gods Church in these Kingdoms, to pray for Zion, and in their Writings, Discourses, and Prayers, and Sermons to have this phrase familiar in their mouths, The Church of God, that is the Church of God in *England*, meaning thereby not any one Sect or Party among us, though perhaps many may be but too partial, and incline to this or that particular Sect or Party too much, and have too small regard for the rest; but for the main they do mean all the Christian Ministers and people throughout the Nation, Tares and Wheat mingled together, as distinguished from Heathens and meer no Christians and persons without the Church, and from the Christians of other Countries. And on the other hand on the Conformists part, and those who are counted the Church of *England* men, do they not count all the Parish meetings so many Churches, and the Parish ministers true Ministers? Is any thing more ordinary in speech, than

than going to Church, and being in the Church, and coming from the Church, meaning thereby the place where Ministers and People do use to meet for the publick worship of God, and their Assembling there for that intent? So that this phrase, the Church of England, doth not in the least put down the Parish Churches, and the particular stated meetings, Synagogues, and Congregations all the land over; and yet in a godly and sound sense they are all but one *Zion*, one heavenly City, even the Church of England, or the Church of God in England. For the further opening and evincing thereof, I will shew one common error or mistake in multitudes of our able Divines. Let no man be prejudiced against the truth for my sake, who do but open it. I beg favour from none. Equity is my due from all. Do me but common right and equity, and overthrow my assertions and allegations if you can. Truth is its own uphold. The error I tax is this, That those we call particular Churches are counted parts and members of the Church Universal. This I deny. I will first shew you by clear citations out of the Authors themselves who they are that hold this, and that it is held by many eminent Divines; and next I will shew the unsoundness of it. Mr. *Baxters* words you have heard before, he makes the Church of England, or the Churches of England, to be an integral part of the Church Universal; and *Ibid.* *Engl.* 36. pag. 126. he says, That particular Churches are part of the Universal, as a Troop is of an Army, or a City of a Kingdom. For the *Presbyterians* you have the late famous Assembly of

of Divines at Westminster, putting it into their Confession of Faith, Chap. 25. S. 4. that particular Churches are members of the Church Universal: and Mr Hudson in his Indication of the Essence and Unity of the Church Catholick visible, pag. 94, 95. thus saying, For my part I conceive and conclude, that the Church Catholick visible, is totum integrale, and the particular Churches are partes similes, or members and parcels thereof. As the Jewish Synagogues were of the Jewish Church, though with some more privilege for both Sacraments. And pag. 124. he affirms, That indeed the federal Congregations are members of the Church Universal. For the Independents you have Mr Norton in his Treatise of the Doctrine of Godliness, defining a visible Church to be a similar part of the Catholick Church. And in his Answer to Apollonius, pag. 87. *Ecclesia particularis pro variis earum rationibus habens se ut partes & ut adjuncta Ecclesie Catholicae.* To the same purpose saith Dr. Ames, *medul. l. 1. c. 32. s. 14. Congregationes illae particulares, sunt quasi partes similes Ecclesie Catholicae.* And s. 5. *Ecclesia particularis respectu Ecclesie Catholicae, qua habet rationem integram, est membrum.* Mr Bartlet (a great Independent) in his model, p. 45. confesseth the particular Churches to be similar parts of the Church Catholick, and saith, the Independents have left it upon record, that they are so, and for that cites Ames, *medul. c. 32.* and Mr William Sedgewick in his Sermon before diverse of the Parliament, pag. 4. So now you see the point against which I am to argue; namely, that particular Churches are parts and members of the Church Universal, and you see who they are that hold it. These are all that I am fur-



furnished with Books to make citations out of. I will now shew the error of this point. Only one thing I will say, lest I forget, for the clearing of the Independents, that it is not all the Independents that do hold this opinion. For to my remembrance Mr. *Thomas Hooker*, in his *Survey of Church discipline* holds the contrary, and many of the *New England* Divines concurred with him, and gave their unanimous assent to the points set down in his Book. And in this I concur with them. I overthrow this said error by this reason or Argument. One and the same thing cannot be both a body and a member, a whole and a part, a society and one single person. But now that which we call a single or particular Church is not a member but a body, it is not a limb or part of a Church, but a whole and entire Church; it is not one single person, but a society or combination of persons. *1 Cor. 14. 23.* *If the whole Church be come together into one place,* mark, here is that which we call a single or particular Church, and yet it hath a whole within it and intrinsecal to it. It is no absurdity to say all or the whole Church of God in *England*, nor to say all the Parish or the whole Parish; meaning thereby all the Christians in the Parish both Pastor and people. *London* is not a member of *England*, but it is a City or aggregation of members. A Family is not a member of the Town, but it is a Family or compacted Society, consisting of many members. It is no less than a flat contradiction in terms, saving the reverence and piety of so eminent a man, what Dr. *Ame's* saith, *medul. l. 1. c. 32. s. 5.* that a particular

C

Church

Church est membrum ex aggregatione variorum membrorum singulorum compositum, is a member aggregate of diverse single members; as if he should say, the whole body is one member, and one member is the whole body, contrary to common reason, and plain Scripture, 1 Cor. 12. 14, 18, 19, 20.

A Church is a composition of unites, or a body compacted of diverse consimilar and homogeneous members. Every true Christian is a *totum integrale*, that is, he is a compleat Christian, or Church-member. He hath all the requisites of a Church-member. *Bonum oritur ex causis integris*. But no one Christian can be a society, as a single unite cannot be a thousand, or a plurality. Besides a bare member in the body hath no Authority. The natural body is not capable of rational governing Authority. But a Minister is an Officer of Christ, and hath proper Authority as a Steward and Embassador, when he Baptizeth and giveth the Lords Supper, he doth them as an Officer of Christ; so also when he Preacheth, he Preacheth not meerly as a Gifted man, but as an Embassador of Christ, and Minister of the Gospel by Office and Calling. But a bare member in the body, acteth by meer natural life and appetite, and is not endued with rational authority, nor can be capable of any. It is a rule in Logick, *membra omnis bonae divisionis debent esse inter se opposita*. But that which we call a single or particular Church, is a Catholick or Universal Church. It hath an Universal head Christ Jesus. It consisteth of at least three, every one whereof is of a Catholick and impartial spirit.

rit. To be a Christian is to be of an Universal impartial Spirit, and none but Christians can constitute a Church. And where there are three there is an all. *Tria sunt omnia.* And note well the words of Mr. Baxter, *Ecclesiastical Cases, quest. 13.* "The Antients differently used the "terms [*A Catholick Church*] and [*The Catholick Church.*] By the first they meant any particular "Church which was part of the Universal. By "the second they meant the Universal Church "it self. Whence it is plain that according to the judgment of the Ancient Fathers, every particular Church may well be termed a Catholick Church, or a Church Universal.

Where there is an all, there is an Universal. But now every single or particular Church hath an all within it, the Pastor and all his Flock. When all the world was drowned by water excepting eight persons, those eight were all the Church both universal and particular. And now that the Church is spread far and near, and the Kingdoms of this world are become the Kingdoms of Christ, the Church Universal and particular do only differ as to place and number. A Church of godly Ministers and people in *France* or *Holland*, differs but from a Church of godly Ministers and people in *England*, as to place; as to principles, and those things which do constitute a Church, they are not two but one. So the Church Universal differs from a particular Church in point of numeration. The Church particular is as twenty men, the Church Universal is as twenty thousand, but this makes not another sort of men. A multiplication of

unites of the same kind, makes no new kind. Doubtless every true Christian is a Catholick Christian, a man of an Universal spirit, loving God and goodness and all good men, and hating all sin. And every Church made up of a number or multitude of such, must needs be a Church Universal or a Catholick Church, not a limb or member of another Church, but a true body or entire Christian Society, compacted of a guiding and guided part, Jesus Christ being the head, root, and foundation to them all, in a transcendent incommunicable sense.

The principal objection against this is, That if every particular or single Church be a body, then so many single Churches, so many bodies of Christ, whereas Christs body is but one. So argues Mr. *Hudson* against Mr. *Cotton*, *Vindication of the Essence and Unity of the Church Catholick*, pag. 18. And also Mr. *Calamy* in his Commendatory Epistle prefixed before Mr. *Hudsons* Book.

Whereto I Answer by concession, That so many single or particular Churches, so many bodies or Christian societies; and yet I deny that hence it will follow that Christs body is not one. Christs body is one. How one? not as one is opposed to multitude. Multitude and unity may well consist. But it is one, as opposed to division, contrariety, and destruction. The Saints and Angels in Heaven are millions of unites or distinct persons, and yet they be all one in love and affection. There are multitudes of Saints and Churches of Saints in the World, and yet they are but one Holy Society, or Heavenly Corpora-

Corporation. Husband and Wife are one Flesh, and yet they are two distinct persons. So Christ and the Believer are one in spirit, and yet they are two distinct persons, and subsistent beings. Every sincere Christian is the Bride and Spouse of Jesus Christ, *Cant. 6. 3. My beloved is mine and I am his.* Yet will it not hence follow that Christ hath so many Wives as there are Saints. For they all make but one *New Jerusalem*, and one Bride the Lambs Wife, because of that one spirit which doth quicken and dwell in them all. The union between Christ and Believers, and between Believers among themselves, in and through Christ, is more noble, firm and excellent, than any other union in this world, as that between Husband and Wife, Head and Members, the Soul and the Body. Adherence to the letter of Scripture metaphors and similitudes, and stretching them beyond the just meaning of the Holy Ghost causeth many errors.

But this will lead me to shew the unsoundness of another point or two in Mr. *Baxters* Doctrine, and some others with him.

*Ecclesiastical Cases, quest. 56.* he saith, "There are two essentially different Policies, or forms of Church Government of Christs own institution never to be altered by man; 1. The form of the Universal Church as headed by Christ himself; which all Christians own, as they are Christians, in their Baptism.

"2. Particular Churches which are headed by their particular Bishops or Pastors, and are parts of the Universal, as a Troop is of an Army, or a City of a Kingdom. And he de-



fines the Universal Church to be *The universality of Baptized visible Christians, headed by Jesus Christ himself.* These his sayings contain many errors. I will first note them out, and then convict and prove them to be errors. 1. It is one error in the act of defining to put in those words, headed by Christ himself. 2. It is another error to define the Universal Church without Guides and Ministers, as one essential constituent part. 3. It is another error to say that the Universal Church, and Churches particular do differ essentially.

1. It is an error in the art of defining to say that the Universal Church is the universality of Christians headed by Christ himself. Headed by Christ himself is supposed, but need not be in the definition. He himself finds fault with such a defect in the definition of a particular Church, *Ecclesiastical Cases, Quest. 57. 131.* Grant them to be Christians, and you do includedly grant them to own Christ for their Sovereign Lord, Head and Saviour.

2. It is an error to define the Universal Church without Pastors and Ministers, as he doth. So also doth the Assemblies Confession, directly affirming that Christ is sole head of the Church, and defining the Church Universal to be *all those throughout the world, that profess the true Religion, together with their Infants.* So also Mr. Hudson, *The whole Company of visible Believers throughout the world.* Mark you, in all these definitions Pastours and Guides are not so much as named, whereas they are of the very essence and constitution of Gods Church both universal and

*And is not our Lord Jesus as essential to y<sup>e</sup> Church as the part-  
ministers? And if he must be supposed in y<sup>e</sup> de-  
finition of y<sup>e</sup> Church we may be ministers too*

particular in this world in an ordinary way. Let Mr. Baxter himself decide the case, *The true and only way of Concord, part. 3. pag. 43.* No doubt but *Christ's Universal Church hath ever had Teachers and Pastors, as the most noble organical part; and a body may as well be without a stomach, liver, or lungs, as the Church be without them.* Now Reader judge by Mr. Baxters own words, if his definition of the Church universal without Guides and Pastors, be not as if he had defined a living and healthful man without a stomach, liver, or lungs. Mark Gods word herein, *God hath set some in the Church, first Apostles, secondly Prophets, thirdly Teachers, &c.* 1 Cor. 12. 28. and Mat. 28. 19, 20. *Go and teach, or disciple, all Nations, baptizing them, &c.* Here is Christ the Supream King, laying the foundation of all the Christian Churches, and of the Church Universal to the worlds end, by commissionating extraordinary and ordinary Pastors and Ministers, for the Discipling and Profelyting of souls to him, and entring them into his Church by Baptism. So that without the Apostles first, and after them ordinary Pastors and Teachers, there neither is nor can be any Christian Church. If there be no Pastors, the Church is perished, or Women and Children may claim to be Apostles and Prophets and Teachers, and make Churches and Ordinances at their pleasure.

3. Whereas he says, That the Church Universal and Churches particular do differ essentially, and that the difference lyes in this, that the Universal Church is headed by Christ himself, and particular Churches are headed by

their particular Bishops. I cannot tell what Mr. Baxter may think of this Doctrine, but to me it seems very strange that God should be said to institute two Churches, or two forms of Churches essentially different. If there be an essential difference between Church and Church, what then is the difference between the Church and World, between the Righteous and the Wicked, between Heaven and Hell? How can any man know which is the right Church? We shall never be able to confute Popery nor Infidelity by this Doctrine. For this Doctrine supposeth two essentially different Churches. The Universal Church without Pastors, and of this Christ is head himself. Particular Churches, of which Christ is no head, but particular Pastors are the heads. By this Doctrine the same thing shall be contrary to it self. For it is most certain that Christs Church in this world is but one. And can one and the same thing have two different Essences, beings and definitions? *Quæ conveniunt in uno tertio conveniunt inter se.* But the Church Universal, and Churches particular, do agree *in uno tertio.* They stand but upon one foundation, they are directed by one rule, they are quicked by one spirit, they do but differ as twenty men, and twenty thousand men, which is only a difference in numeration, not in divinity and godliness. A multiplication of unites of the same kind cannot produce an essentially different kind. An addition of homogeneous consimilar particles makes no essential difference. We are now upon a point of holiness and Christian morality, and *in genere morum* there is but one

one essential or grand difference, and that is between Christ and Belial, between serving God and serving Satan, between the Righteous and the Wicked, between Heaven and Hell. If there be two Churches or constituted Societies of Gods founding essentially differing, it will necessarily infer that God is contrary to himself, and that the essentiating principles of Church-holiness, order, and government are black and white, darkness and light. To say Christ is head to the Church universal and not to Churches particular, is to say and unsay. Bishops and Pastors, are Bishops and Pastors in the Church Universal. They can be but in one place at once, but they may have large charity, and pray for the good of all, and bear upon their hearts the state of the Church and world, and in imitation of *Paul* care for all the Churches, 2 *Cor.* II. 28. Was not *Paul* in some sense a Pastor to all the Churches? were not all the Churches bound to own him for an Apostle of Christ, and a most prime Officer in Gods Church, the chief of all the Pastors in the world under Christ? *Subordinata non pugnant.* *Paul* may be an Apostle and the Prince of all the Pastors throughout the Churches, and yet no way invade the Office of Christ. Christ and *Paul* do very well agree. If this opinion stand, Religion cannot stand. For *formidat esse.* Two essentially different forms of Churches, will infer two sorts of holiness, the one repugnant to the other. For it is holiness which is to the Church what the Soul is to the Body. If, says Christ, *I should say I know not my Father, I shall be a liar, Joh. 8. 55.* In like manner

manner we may say by way of impossible supposition, If Christ set up two repugnant or essentially different Religions or Church-forms, he is not the Saviour but the deceiver of the world.

*Obj.* But can any but Christ be head of the Catholick Church? Do not Protestants generally count the Pope Antichrist, because he claims to be head of the Catholick Church?

*Ans.* There is no man can be head to any Church, Person, or Thing, so as Christ is. Yet is the Husband the head of his Wife, 1 Cor. 11. 3. And there are some who are heads of the people, 1 Chron. 12. 32. The Gileadites made Jephtha their head, that is their Captain, or chief Ruler, Judg. 11. 6, 8, 9, 11. Exod. 18. 25. And there was a time when the Church was so small, one man might well be sole head or Pastor to it under Christ. And now that the Church is multiplied, Pastors also are multiplied, but still the Church-form is but one. As Christ is the same yesterday, and to day, and for ever; so Holiness or the Love of God and man, which is as the life and soul of the Church, is the same yesterday, to day, and for ever. If the Pope claim no more but to be St. Peters successor, then he can but *succedere in universum jus defuncti*, and claims only so much Office, Jurisdiction and Superiority in the Church as Peter would have, were he now alive as sometime he was. This though it be more than he can justly claim, is not a direct invading of the office of Christ. If Peter were now living, I suppose all that have read the New Testament, and have a reverence for Christ and his Apostles, would acknowledge Peter to be



be an Apostle, and consequently above ordinary Ministers in Office, and to be under Christ the most principal Pastor and Minister upon Earth, and worthy to be so esteemed by all who have the Records of the New Testament, and believe the same, and know that *Peter* only of all the Apostles is yet alive. If the Pope claim no more, he doth not directly claim the Office of Christ, but only the Office of *Peter*. And suppose a man have so much Charity for the Pope, as to think that if *Peter* were now alive, and at *Rome*, and known to the Pope, the Pope would resign his place to him, and give him the honour of being above him; if he err, it is a charitable error. If the Roman Emperour do make the Bishop of *Rome* Primate of his Empire, as the Archbishop of *Canterbury* is of all *England*, *Episcopus prime sedis*, this were no ground for him to claim more, this were neither to invade the Office of Christ, nor the Office of an Apostle. If this were all that could be objected against the Pope, I should think Protestants much to blame, and the Pope a right good man, and worthy to be so esteemed by the Churches.

But if the Pope claim more than his due, how doth that prove Christ to have instituted two essentially different Church-Forms?

*Obj.* There ought to be no such thing as *Episcopus Episcoporum*, a Bishop over Bishops in Gods Church. All Ministers ought to be independent, and learn of one another as equals in Office, though not equal in gifts, *Ecclesiastical Cases quest. 57.*

*Ans.* It will be hard for you to prove what you say. I think the contrary to be evident. Shall every common Minister have equal entire Office  
in

in the Church with an Apostle, with a most eminent Minister, with a *Calvin*, an *Augustine*, a *Mr Baxter*? God forbid. They may have equal Office as to some things, and yet be unequal, and have small or no Office, as to many other things. *Numb. 3. 6, 7. Bring the tribe of Levi near, and present them before Aaron the Priest, that they may minister unto him. And they shall keep his charge, and the charge of the whole Congregation. v. 32. Eleazar the Son of Aaron the Priest, shall be chief over the house of the Levites, and have the oversight of them that keep the charge of the Sanctuary.* Lo here was a Bishop or Overseer over the Lords Ministers. The Levites Office was twofold, *teaching and sacrifice, Deut. 33. 10.* They were dispersed in Synagogues all the land over, *Gen. 49. 7. 2 Chr. 17. 8, 9, 10. Jer. 3. 15.* They were masters of the Assemblies, *Eccl. 12. 11. Mal. 2. 4, 5, 6, 7. Ps. 74. 8.* Israel was twelve Tribes, people for multitude like the sands upon the Sea shore, God took care that they should be provided of a just Ministry for their Souls. But he did not make all the Pastors of *Judea* equal in Office, though unequal in Gifts. He set an Archbishop, Patriarch, or Primate, over the whole Nation, and ordained by solemn Law, *The man that will do presumptuously, and will not hearken unto the Priest (that standeth to minister there before the Lord thy God) or unto the Judge, even that man shall die, Deut. 17. 12.*

And when Christ came to form the New Testament Church, he ordains and sets in the Church, first Apostles, secondarily Prophets, thirdly teachers, helps, governments, &c. *1 Cor. 12. 28.* He did not make all Ministers equal in Office. Do but mark

the

the Churches in *France*, *Geneva*, the Dutch Churches, the Independents and Presbyterians, and you will find that under other names and titles they have their governing Bishops, Presbyteries, Elderships and Superintendents, all have not equal office, rule, and authority, all are not permitted to ordain, all are not principal men, and Pillars, *Gal. 2. 9.* What is said of the *Children of Issachar*, *1 Chr. 12. 32.* may be applied to most Sects and Parties. *The heads of them were two hundred, and all their brethren were at their Commandment.* We may learn wisdom from an Enemy. There is some order among the Devils themselves for the more effectual managing of their affairs. If Satan cast out Satan, how can his Kingdom stand? There is *Beelzebub* the Prince of Devils. All have not equal Office and rule. There is order and governing Policy among Thieves and Robbers, among Papists and Quakers. They have their Head-men, all have not equal office and authority. They see a necessity of having variety of Officers and Offices, and that all have not equal rule, for the better uphold of their Faction and Party. If all Ministers must be equal in Office, then they must have equal power to ordain Ministers, to visit the Churches, to censure all sorts of Offenders, to sit in judgment when Ecclesiastical Causes be in handling, to moderate or be members of Synods and Convocations, to hear and determine Appeals, to write Books, and compose Catechisms, and Forms of sound words for the Churches, and for the help of the meaner sort, to dispute against Hereticks and convince Gainsayers, to hold correspondence with Foreign Churches,

Churches, to be employed by the Magistrate in Causes and Negotiations Ecclesiastical. This were (to use Mr Baxters words in another Case, *Treatise of Confirmation*, pag. 180, 181.) as if in mercy to the School-boys, you should set them that cannot read English in the highest Form, where they must make Orations in Latin and Greek, or else be whipt: would they thank you for such advancement? It is as if you should put an unexercised Cowardly Souldier, or one that is but learning to use his arms, into the Battel, for his honour: or as if you should prefer a Pupil to be a Tutor, or put a Freshman into the Doctors Chair, or admit a new baptized Novice to be a Pastor of the Church, where the blood of the people shall be required at his hands; or as if to honour him, you should admit any common Mariner to the Pilots place, or any Apothecary to play the Physician to other mens ruine, and his own shame. If you set such Children on Horse back, while you pretend their good, you will break their Necks. No man is safe out of his own rank and place. There is no man can be a Pastor, either *Episcopus gregis* or *Episcopus Episcoporum gregis* in the sense that Christ is. And there is no just ordained Minister but he is a Pastor in the Church Universal, and in a sound sense is both a Shepherd over the Sheep and Shepherds. If a Presbyter or common Minister shall preach to a Synod of Pastors, Bishops, and Archbishops, he preacheth to them not as a meer gifted man, but as an Embassador of Christ, and is truly, at least in one sense for the time, *Episcopus Episcoporum*, or *Pastor Pastorum*, or *Episcoporum*, an Officiating Pastor to all that hear him. He preacheth to them in the name of Christ, he that heareth him heareth Christ,

Christ, and he that heareth not him, heareth not Christ, *Luke* 10. 16. If a Justice of Peace shall come into a Town, and be drunk, and grossly mis-demean himself, and break the Kings Peace, another Justice by vertue of his Office hath power to order him; yea a common Constable whose Oath binds him to see that the Peace be kept, may in the Kings name require and charge the Peace to be kept, and execute his Office upon a Criminal Justice of Peace. He is to use and treat him as one in Office, and superiour to him in Office: but all Offices being from the King, and for the common good, no mans crimes and delinquencies can privilege him from the just execution of the Kings Law and Authority upon him, by such Officers as be appointed by the King. The Constables Authority is the Kings Authority. The words of Christ and *Peter*, *Mat.* 20. 25, 26, 27. *Luke* 22. 24, 25, 26. *1 Pet.* 5. 3. do plainly forbid all carnal insolvency, domination, desire, and striving to be great, and lording it over Gods Heritage. But *he that desireth the Office of a Bishop desireth a good work, and office and humility may well consist.* Christ and *Peter* do not forbid sound order and humility. They do not say that every infant shall be a man; or that Women shall be Preachers and Pastors of Souls, or that every Constable shall be a Lord Chancellor, or that every *Corah* or common Levite shall be an *Aaron* or Chief Priest. If it be Church-Tyranny, and against the rules of Church Government, that there be *Episcopus Pastorum*, one man to have the charge and oversight of many Pastors and Churches in a limited qualified sense as a general Officer and Superintendent in the



the Church, then take heed lest this lead not to the same thing in the Common-Wealth. For the word Pastor agreeth to Magistrates. The Scripture calls *Cyrus* a Heathen King, Gods Shepherd, *Isa.* 44. 28. God chose *David* to feed his people *Israel*, that is, to be King over them, *Psal.* 78. 70, 71. Frequently in *Homer*, as the Learned know, *Agamemnon* is said to be *Pastor Populi*, Shepherd of the people. Now if it be simply unlawful and inconvenient in the Church, to be a Ruler over Rulers, a Shepherd over Shepherds, *Episcopus Episcoporum* in a limited and sound sense, it will endanger the Common-Wealth Government, and level all Offices in the State. The King is by Office a nursing Father, *Episcopus ad extra*, or supreme Ruler over all the Magistrates in the Nation, who are in their places subordinate Common-Wealth Rulers, coercive Shepherds, and *Episcopi Reipublicae*. Indeed the King hath no Kingly Office and jurisdiction save within his Kingdom, nor the Constable save within his Town, nor the Sheriff save within his County, nor the Lord Maior save within his City. But it is not so in Gods Church. For the Church is but one Society, Corporation, City, or Kingdom. Every Minister is by Office and Calling a Minister therein, and hath authority by teaching, by baptizing, and administering the Lords Supper, to serve Christ and be helpful to Souls, in any place, where ever he shall come, and shall have just call to exercise his office. Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every Creature, *Mark* 16. 15. Go and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the father, &c. teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded

manded you: and lo, I am with you alway even unto the end of the world, Amen. Mat. 28. 19, 20. And he that doth soundly preach the Gospel, doth exercise sound discipline, and the most noble part of Pastoral Discipline. But we will give our selves continually to prayer, and to the ministry of the word, Act. 6. 4. Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel, 1 Cor. 1. 17. A Minister doth by sound teaching exercise the most principal jurisdiction, he doth bind and loose, he doth Ministerially and Authoritatively open and shut the Kingdom of Heaven, he absolves the penitent, and denounceth the threatnings and Condemnation of God against the impenitent.

Ministers do not by Ordination beget Ministers as Parents do their Children. Natural Generation and Ordination of Ministers do very much differ. Though all Presbyters have equal Ordination, that will not infer that therefore they have equal entire office in Gods Church. It may suffice that there be an equality as to some things, and as to some main parts and branches of the Office, such as in common do appertain to all Presbyters. But there be other parts and branches which do not of right appertain to all, but to some singular persons only, partly for order and decorum sake, and to avoid the mischiefs and confusions of popularity, where all have equal rule; partly because some are dignified by God with some more gifts and graces than common Ministers are, and thereby God doth notifie to all the Churches that he intends them for some more work and office in the Church than vulgar Ministers, and would have them to be doubly esteemed.

*Obj.* This way of making Bishops, Archbishops, and Patriarchs hath been the very engine of dividing, corrupting and undoing the Christian Churches above a thousand years, *Ecclesiastical Cases, Quest. 37.*

*Answ.* That which corrupts and damages the Church is not the making of divers Officers in the Church, and the just distribution of Offices, appointing some to one part, and others to another part; but the placing of unworthy and insufficient men in office, and the errors and exorbitancies of men in office. You may by like reason argue, that the making of Kings, Emperours, Counsellors, Statesmen, Lord Chancellors, and great men hath been the Engine of corrupting, dividing, and undoing both the Christian and Pagan World for more than five thousand years. *Delirant Reges, plebuntur Achivi.* To argue *à non causa ut causa* is not good. As men are, so they will act in any office both in Church and Common-wealth. The best things may be abused. The way to reform a disordered State is not to make every Constable a Lord Chief Justice. If my Lord Chancellor take Bribes and pervert justice, and give evil Counsel, and through his means the Realm is oppressed; the way of reformation is not for the heads and people of the Kingdom, against the will of the King to bind themselves by solemn Oath to endeavour the extirpation of his office, and that there may be no more Lord Chancellors. *Pro. 13. 10. Only by pride cometh contention.* And is it incident to Bishops and Archbishops only to be proud? Indeed they have in some respects greater temptations than others have. So have Kings,

Kings, Counsellors, Judges, Lord Maiors, and even all that be great and above others in Worldly wealth and eminency. But as there have been godly and humble Kings, Counsellors, Senators, and great men, so there have been Bishops and Archbishops, and they might all be so if they would. There is no man nor Office wholly without temptations. Wars and fightings come from mens inward lusts and passions, *Jam. 4. 1.* And these lusts be in all men by nature more or less, and are not cured but by grace. There is pride in inferiours as well as superiours. You would have all Ministers to be independent, equal in office, though not equal in gifts. Is not this to make weak and inferiour Ministers proud?

*Obj.* Synods and Assemblies of Ministers are for Consultation and Concord, not for Regiment and Authority. Certainly the Magistrate must see that they become not an Aristocratical or Monarchical Church-Government, and that none be forced to approve them, or such humane forms of Churches.

*True and only way of Concord, Part. 3. p. 234.*

*Answ.* Where two or three are gathered together in Christs name, he is in the midst of them, *Mat. 17. 20.* Two are better than one, and a threefold Cord is not easily broken, *Eccl. 4. 9, 10, 11, 12.* Not forsaking the assembling of your selves, as the manner of some is, *Hebr. 10. 25.* It includes all decent, just, and godly Assemblies of Ministers as well as others. We are not to make an opposition between Concord and Government. Godly Synods and Presbyteries, are for all three, Consultation, Concord, and Authority. Otherwise the Apostles, Elders, and Brethren would not have met at *Jerusalem,*

for the decision of a controversy and difficulty which then troubled the Churches, and made a solemn Decree or Church-Order, *Act. 15.* It was not a bare Counsel, but it was a godly and wholesome Decree or Church-Order, unanimously agreed upon by the Apostles, Elders and Brethren, and is so called by the Holy Ghost, *Act. 16. 4.* by the just observance whereof *the Churches were established in the faith, and increased in number daily, v. 5.* Suppose an Independent common Minister had taken on him to have made such a Decree, and had sent it abroad to all the Churches, would it have been well taken, could he have justified his doings, and would his writing have had equal reverence and authority with that other Decree in all the Churches? No. The Magistrate must see that Synods of Ministers turn not into licentiousness and tyranny; but he must not see that they be contemned and counted a community of common men, and their Consultations and Decrees being wholesome and godly, be observed or not observed. It was the Magistrates sin that he did not embrace the Christian Religion, and by his Authority and Sanction countenance and confirm the Decree of the Apostles and Elders at *Jerusalem.* He hath his Office for God and the publick good. He is to approve what God doth approve, and ratifie what God doth ratifie, and be a terror to evil doers, and a defence to them that do well. But such as despise the Lords Ministers, and the wholesome Counsels, appointments and Decrees of godly Synods and Presbyteries, and causelessly violate the same, are not well but evil doers. Such as are weak in the Faith are to



be received, but not to doubtful disputations. But the due reverence of just and lawful Meetings and Synods of eminent Ministers, and obedience to their wholsome and godly Decrees, is not a point of doubtful disputation. See *Deut.* 17. 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13. Such ways of Church-Government are not merely humane. They are godly Assemblies, and Gods presence is with them, while they behave themselves godly, and establish nothing but what is good for the Church.

*Obj.* But if you define the Church of *England* by all the Christian Pastors and People of *England*, then you will bring in the Dissenters to be Members of the Church of *England*, and such as separate from the Parish-Churches and Communion.

*Answ.* Such Dissenters as be sincere godly persons must needs be members of the Church Universal, and consequently members of Gods Church in *England*. And such Conformable Ministers and people as be Hypocrites and ungodly, are no right and true sons of the Church of *England*. They are but as tares among the Wheat. They who are not the Sons of God are not the Sons of the Church. The Church of *England* is not to be made a Sect Church, Such as be Heirs of Heaven, and have their abode in *England*, may well be allowed to be members of the Church of *England*. Either those which separate, do well or ill in separating. If well, it is their vertue, you are to praise them for it, and think the Church of *England* honoured by them. If they do ill, it is their sin. But every sin doth not Un-Church and Un-Saint a man. You may sin more in over-judging their sin. I determine not which side is in the right. But I am certain, that the best

are not absolutely perfect, and that all that are sincere for the main, are sound members of Gods Church in *England*, and none but they till God have made more such by his Converting grace. Mr *Hudson* seems to require more to the Constitution of a national Church than I do, *pag. 15. Of his Treatise upon the Church*, I fetch my description of a National Church or Christian Nation from the plain words of Christ, *Mat. 28. 19. Go and teach all nations baptizing them, &c.* They are a Nation before the Gospel comes to them. When the ruling Powers of the Nation, and the main body of the people have submitted themselves to Christ by Baptism, and are Christened, and have Pastors and Teachers set over them; they are then a National Church, or a Christian Nation. Notable is that of the Apostle, *1 Pet. 1. 2.* he calls the believing Jews scattered throughout *Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, the flock of God, 1 Pet. 5. 2. an holy nation, 1 Pet. 2. 9.* They were not all the Christians in the World, nor were they one particular flock or single Company, but they were many distant flocks and Congregations; and yet he calls them all, *The flock of God.* And the title of the Common Prayer Book is observable, it nameth both *the Church of England, and Churches*, teaching thereby that *England* is but one Church of God, consisting of all the Christian Pastors and people in it, and yet it hath many worshipping stated Congregations and Assemblies, which are real and true Churches.

*Obj.* The great controversie of the age and many ages, is about the true and formal difference between the lowest species of Churches, which is called

called a particular or single Church, and an association of Churches, or a compound Church. *True and only way of Concord*, pag. 234, 235. He intimates as if they did differ specifically, and not merely gradually, and that there is more in this than all are aware of.

*Answ.* The Controversie seems to be rather about the name than the thing; or if it be about the thing, perhaps it is but some few rigid Contenders that do differ about it. When the Apostles did institute the Order of Deacons to a certain Office in the Church, this did not make a new Church. And when the Apostles, Elders, and Brethren met together at *Jerusalem* to consider about a present Controversie which troubled the Churches, *Act. 15.* and ordained a Church-Decree, this did not make another kind of Church. The Church is all along but one, but there are divers parts and branches of Church Government, which cannot be done in that which is called a particular Church, or not so conveniently. Synods and associations of Ministers do not differ, either gradually or specifically from a particular Church. The difference lies only in this, that there are some parts of Church-Order and Government reserved for the stated ordinary Assembly or particular Church, and other some are reserved for the Diocesan Bishop, and for Presbyteries, Synods, and associations of Ministers. There is a just harmony and consistency between the whole and the several parts, as between the Watch and all the Wheels, and Pins, and parts in it. Many consistent Wheels and parts in the Watch, do not make many Watches differing

either gradually or specifically. The Watch is one uniform, compacted, regular frame, or composition: So also is the Church, *Mat. 18. 17.* Christ nameth Councils and Synagogues as distinct. They are not a compound Church. The being of the one doth not prejudice the other. Both are useful, and may well stand with good order, if men do not abuse them.

*Obj.* If every Market Town had a Bishop, and the Country Parishes adjoining were made Chapels, and distributed accordingly to the several Towns, it would be like the old state of the Church about three hundred, and four hundred, and five hundred years after Christ, and much better than it is, though not as it should be. *True and only way of Concord, pag. 241.*

*Ans.* If another man had said so, perhaps Mr Baxter would have thought it no wise, charitable, godly, and humble censure. In your sense the Church means the Universal, visible Church, or all the Christian Pastors and people through the World. You seem to connect all these, and the Government of the Churches by them, or the greatest part of them, about three, yea four, yea five hundred years after Christ. And the way and Constitution of Church-Government with us you censure to be much worse than that of the ancients forenamed.

*Obj.* The safety of all the Churches (of a Nation, Empire, or the World) may be better preserved by Gods three great means. (1. The Polity of particular Churches with the conduct of their present faithful Bishops or Pastors. 2. The loving Consociation of neighbour Pastors for Concord.

cord. 3. The protection and countenance of Magistrates.) God hath left all Bishops independent, and to learn of one another, as equals in office, and unequal only in gifts, *Ecclesiastical Cases, Quest. 37.*

*Answ.* This is your much better way. I suppose you mean it of this way what you say in the Preface to your Book of Concord. You there express, *that you are fully perswaded that it is divine, pure, harmless, comprehensive, fitted by Christ himself to the interest of all good men, yea of the Church, and all the World.*

If you be not right in this matter, you are certainly very wrong. I do not see how your assertion can stand without manifest contradiction to the wisdom of God in forming the Government of his Church of old, I mean in *Israel*. Your assertion is Universal, it reacheth the state of the Church before Christs time, as well as since. Certainly all the Bishops and Pastors in *Israel* were not equals in office. *Corah* affecting to be equal in Office with *Aaron* was suddenly cut off by dreadful judgment. And that all Ministers be independent, and learn of one another, as equals in Office, though unequal in gifts, is contrary to the very rules and principles of Government and Concord. It is a levelling principle. It may serve for a job: but it cannot stand long. The Apostle saith, *All of you be subject one to another,* 1 Pet. 5. 5. *In lowliness of mind let each esteem other better than themselves,* Phil. 2. 3. But he doth not say, let all Ministers be equal in Office, and no one have more Office in the Church than another. Where there is no right Government there can be no right Concord.



Concord. For true Concord is the genuine inseparable effect of right Government, if not contained in it. Now right Government is the right placing of things, as when all the members of the body being well and sound do each perform their Office, this causeth health. So when all in the Church are well and duly constituted, and fulfil their place and office, this is right order, thence issueth Concord and quiet. But now the making of all Ministers equal in Office, though unequal in gifts, cannot be the way of good Government, because it maketh the feet to have equal place and office in the body with the eyes and tongue; or if not that, it maketh a dim imperfect eye to have the same entire office with a most good and perfect eye, yea a single imperfect eye to have equal office with two good and perfect eyes. It falleth into the same or a worse mischief than that which it studieth to remedy. The mischief which it would remedy is the insolency and ambition of Prelates and Church-Tyranny, as supposed to issue from the Constitution of Church-Government by Bishops, Archbishops, and governing Presbyteries, Councils and Synods. But indeed it forsaketh the true rule and standard of remedying Church-Evils, and setteth up a new rule and standard nowhere found in all the Scriptures, contrary to reason and experience, and the principles not of Church-Government in particular, but of godly Government in the general, both in Family, Church, and Common-wealth. Boaz, had many Reapers, but he had one a Servant whom he set over them, *Ruth* 2. 5. *Solomon* for the building of the Temple set threescore and ten thousand to be Bearers

Bearers of burdens, and fourscore thousand to  
 be hewers in the Mountain, and besides them  
 three thousand and six hundred Overseers to set  
 the people a work, 2 Chr. 2. 18. *Abraham* had  
 in his House three hundred and eighteen Servants,  
*Gen.* 14. 14. But they had not all equal place and  
 office. He had one *Eliker*, who was the Steward  
 of his House, *Gen.* 15. 2. elsewhere he is called  
 the eldest servant of his house, that ruled over all  
 that he had, *Gen.* 24. 2. It pleased *Darius* to set  
 over the Kingdom an hundred and twenty Prin-  
 ces, which should be over the whole Kingdom;  
 And over these, three Presidents (of whom *Daniel*  
 was first) that the Princes might give ac-  
 counts unto them, and the King should have no  
 damage. Then this *Daniel* was preferred above  
 the Presidents and Princes, because an excellent  
 spirit was in him; and the King thought to set  
 him over the whole Realm, *Dan.* 6. 1, 2, 3. King  
*David* had diverse Orders of Worthies. Three  
 that sate first. Three other that sate next, and  
 thirty that sate next to them, 2 Sam. 23. 8. &c.  
 They were all Chieftains and valiant men, but  
 they were not equally so. There were three dis-  
 tinct Orders or Classes of them, and they knew  
 their respective places and meet distances. This  
 was consonant to sound Order and humility. *Mos-*  
*es* by the advice and direction of *Jethro* his Father  
 in Law, chose able men out of all *Israel*, and made  
 them heads over the people, rulers of thousands,  
 rulers of hundreds, rulers of fifties, rulers of  
 tens. And they judged the people at all seasons:  
 the hard causes they brought unto *Moses*, but  
 every small matter they judged themselves, *Exod.*  
 18. 25, 26.

Obj.

*Obj.* But what is all this to Church-Government? no such thing ought to be in the Churches.

*Ans.* Let Mr Baxter answer Mr Baxter. *Treatise of Confirmation*, pag. 299. "For the better promoting of this necessary work [the holiness and Concord of all the Churches] I conceive it would be a very ready and unquestionable way, for the Magistrate to appoint an able, godly, moderate Minister, to be a Visiter in each County, or rather in each half, or quarter of a County, to see the Churches (thus) reformed, and provoke the several Pastors to their duty, and assist them in it, where there is need: But not to have any Episcopal power to punish, or cast out any Minister, or Excommunicate them, suspend them, or the like: But let every Visiter have an Agent of the Magistrate joined with him, armed with authority to Convent the Ministers, and examine Witnesses, and do what more the chief Magistrate shall see meet, so that still these two Visitors go together, but have not the same authority or work; but let the Minister only enquire, direct, exhort, and give account and advice to the civil Visiter; and let the civil Visiter have all the coercive power: and let both of them transmit such causes as are exempt from their determination, to the Commissioners for ejecting scandalous Ministers, who by the advice of the assistant Ministers may determine them. These Visitors did very much to the first and great Reformation of Scotland, when Popery had over-run all: nor did they scruple the using of them, for all that they were against Prelacy. So far he,

How

How can this stand with his other principle forenamed, that all Ministers are to be independent, and to learn one of another, as equals in office, and unequal only in gifts? Here he advises that there be two general Officers in the Church, an Episcopal and a Civil or coercive Visitor, of either sort one for every County, or rather for each half, or quarter of a County, to have charge of the several Pastors and Churches therein, to see them well reformed. They must be named by the Chief Magistrate, and act in their sphere with just dependence upon him. Some causes and matters are supposed to be exempt from their determination, these they must transmit to another sort or order of Church-Officers, and they must determine them. And this he affirms to be a very ready and unquestionable way. If this be so, it is a good plea for the office and calling of Diocesan Bishops and Super-intendents in Gods Church, and particularly for the English frame. Add hereto what he saith in his *Ecclesiastical Cases, Quest. 36. pag. 127, 128.* "In the  
 "Apostles days there were under Christ in the  
 "Church Universal, many general Officers that  
 "had the care of gathering and over-seeing  
 "Churches up and down, and were fixed by sta-  
 "ted relation unto none. Such were the Apostles,  
 "Evangelists, and many of their helpers in their  
 "days. And most Christian Churches think that  
 "though the Apostolical extraordinary gifts, pri-  
 "viledges and offices cease, yet Government be-  
 "ing an ordinary part of their work, the same  
 "form of Government which Christ and the  
 "Holy Ghost did settle in the first Age, were ser-  
 "led

"led for all following ages, though not with  
 "the same gifts and adjuncts. Because 1. We  
 "read of the settling of that form (*viz.* general  
 "Officers as well as particular) but we never  
 "read of any abolition, discharge, or cessation  
 "2. Because if we affirm a Cessation without  
 "proof, we seem to accuse God of mutability in  
 "settling one form of Government for one age  
 "only, and no longer. 3. And we leave room for  
 "audacious wits accordingly to question other  
 "Gospel-Institutions, as Pastors, Sacraments, &c.  
 "and to say that they were but for an age. 4. It  
 "was general Officers that Christ promised to be  
 "with to the end of the World, *Mat.* 28. 19, 20  
 These general Officers he likens to Colonels of  
 Regiments, and fixed Parish-Pastors to Captains  
 of single Troops. How this can stand with his  
 other assertion, that all Ministers are to be equal  
 in office, and unequal only in gifts, I cannot dis-  
 cern. Captains and Colonels have not equal Of-  
 fice in the Army.

According to his words and Counsel to the Ma-  
 gistrate, there are appointed for every Diocess of  
*England* two Visitors, the Bishop and the Chan-  
 cellor, the one for an Episcopal, the other for a  
 civil Visitor, with limited dependence upon the  
 Arch-Bishop, upon the Convocation or National  
 Synod, upon the High Court of Chancery, upon  
 the King, upon the Parliament. Let but worthy  
 men be set in place, and faithfully do their office,  
 and the English frame will be unquestionable.  
 The Diocesan Bishop or Superintendent hath the  
 office of a Presbyter in common with other Pres-  
 byters: but more than that, he hath the special  
 office



office of a Diocesan Superintendent, and after the Example of *Paul*, 2 *Cor.* 11. 28. hath the care of all the Churches in his Diocess, he hath a just and limited charge over them. His office doth not hinder, violate, infringe, or supersede the fixed Pastors Office. They do both consist, being duly managed. The Bishop in his Diocess is not as the bare Foreman of the Jury: but more than that, he is a general Officer in the Church, he is as a Colonel in the Army, he is a Diocesan Superintendent. His office is not a bare name or shadow. It is warranted by the Laws of God and the King. The Chancellor is an Agent of the Magistrate, a kind of Ecclesiastical Judge, for the decision of Church Causes, and the good Government of all the Churches in the Diocess, in just concurrence with the Bishop, and the Bishop with him. As for the English Common Prayer Book, Ceremonies, Canons, and the Subscriptions by Law appointed for Conformists; these are no proper parts of Episcopacy. Episcopacy was before they were, and should they be taken down, Episcopacy would stand. If the Independents or Presbyterians had the Law in their hands, it may be they would be rigid for Conformity to some sinful or suspected terms of their own making, as the late times can witness. Saith Mr. Baxter, *if I had my will, the man should be ejected as a negligent Pastor, that will not rule his people by discipline*, Gildas Salvianus, pag. 224. And all good and Conscientious men cannot Conform to every thing in Mr. Baxters Discipline. Mr. Calvin is for a set Form of Prayer, and Administration of the Sacraments, and Catechizing, *à quâ pastoribus*

*ibus discedere in functione sua non liceat.* "It is a  
 "strange unhappiness, (saith a good man) that  
 "Ministers only of all other persons are found  
 "to be of such an unwholsom temperature, that  
 "their infirmities (if such) can no way be cured,  
 "but (*igne & ferro*) by abscission; no punish-  
 "ment sufficient (almost) for any fault, but silen-  
 "cing, ejection, and the like.

If the institution of Bishops and Archbishops were no more but an Ordinance of man, Gods word binds us to submit to every Ordinance of man for the Lords sake, 1 Pet. 2. 13. and to all such things as are true, honest, just, pure, lovely, of good report, in which there is any vertue, any praise, Phil. 4. 8. Logicians say the Conclusion doth always follow the weaker part of the premises. There is nothing in question but the assumption, whether the institution of Diocesan, Episcopal, and Civil Visitors and Superintendents be lawful or sinful, prudential, or not prudential, profitable or not profitable for the Church. Mr. Baxter yields the assumption, affirming it to be a very ready and unquestionable way. The matter is not whether it be *jure humano*, or *jure divino*, but whether it be *jure*, whether it be pleasing to God and profitable for the Church. It was godly prudence and sound discretion which put the Apostles and Primitive Saints upon to name and appoint certain persons to be Deacons, and have special care of the poor, Act. 6. It was the like prudence and discretion which guided Moses to hearken to the Counsel of Jethro his Father in Law, and set Judges and Officers over the people, Exod. 18. Sound prudence and discretion is from  
 the

the Holy Ghost as well as the Scripture. For he is the Father of lights, from whom cometh every good and perfect gift, *Jam. 1.*

It is a note of evil men to *speake evil of dignities*, 2 *Pet. 2. 10.* And why there should be no dignities in the Church, and it should only mean civil dignities, I understand not. *Ubi lex non distinguit, nobis non est distinguendum.* There was never any Nation or people throughout the World wholly without Religion, or if any, but a very few. The generality of Heathens were much addicted to Religion. Their error lay in mistaking and corrupting Religion. But a Religion they had, and therewith Ministers, Priests, and Clergy men, whose Office was to minister about holy things, and to serve at the Altar. Satan is Gods Ape, as God hath his Worship, Ministry, Sabbaths, Solemn Assemblies, and sacred Rites and Institutions; so contrary Satan hath his. And Satan is too wise and politick to let all his Officers and Ministers be equal in Office. He hath his Head-men, his principal General and Itinerant Ministers, and some that be fixed to their Cures. He hath his greater and lesser Meetings and Consultations, as those that write the stories of Witches do relate. The Babylonians in *Daniels* time had not only their Magicians, Astrologers, Sorcerers, Chaldeans, and such as they termed Wise-men, as many Orders of Priests and Clergymen, *Dan. 2. 2. 27.* but more than that, there were Governours set over these Wise-men, and there were divers Provinces, and *Daniel* was made Chief of the Governours over all the Wise-men of *Babylon*, *v. 48.* compared with *Esther 1. 1.* Can

we think that King *Nebuchadnezzar* had not with him in the Royal City, to attend the Court and be near his presence, some that were of the highest rank of Magicians, and were the Head-men of their Calling, and Rulers and Overseers of the rest? when he called them together to expound and make known to him his Dream, we may reasonably think he called together the heads and chief of them. So may we think of the Philistins, when they called for the Priests and Diviners, to counsel them what to do with the Ark of God, 1 *Sam.* 6. 1. as *Herod* gathered all the Chief Priests and Scribes of the people together, to know of them where Christ should be born, *Mat.* 2. 4. The Egyptians had their Priests, *Gen.* 47. 22. and their Wise-men, Sorcerers, and Magicians, *Exod.* 7. 11. *Pharaoh* set *Joseph* over all the Land of *Egypt*, and made him to be next the King, in Dignity and Honour, and gave him to Wife *Asenath* the Daughter of *Potipherah*, Priest of *On*, *Gen.* 41. 40, &c. 45. Can we think that this Priest of *On* was a vulgar Priest, and not rather a prime and eminent one? otherwise it had been below *Joseph's* advancement and eminency to be matched to his Daughter. *Moses* Father-in-Law is stiled the Priest of *Midian*, *Exod.* 18. 1. we may probably conjecture he was more than a common Priest, it is likely he was a Priest of prime note and eminency among the Midianites. It is conceived by some upon likely grounds, that those two Hebrew Midwives, whom *Pharaoh* gave in charge to destroy the Hebrew Male-Infants, *Exod.* 1. were principal over-seeing Midwives, above the vulgar sort.

This

This question whether there should be Bishops and Superintendents in Gods Church, that is, some principal men in office to oversee all the Churches and Pastors in a Diocess or County, is rather a question pertaining to Government in the general, than to Church-Government in special.

*Obj.* They do but abuse themselves and others, that would perswade us, that Bishops by Christs Institution have any superiority over men further than of Reverence, or that any Bishop is superior to another, further than positive order agreed upon among Christians hath prescribed. It is founded on a Vice contrary to all Christian humility, without which no man shall see his Saviour. Nature and Religion agree in this, that neither of them hath a hand in this Heraldry of *secundum sub & supra*; all this comes from Composition and Agreement of men among themselves. Wherefore this abuse of Christianity to make it lacquey to ambition, is a Vice for which I have no extraordinary name of ignominy, and an ordinary I will not give it, lest you should take so transcendent a Vice to be but trivial. Mr *Hales* in his *Traкт of Schism*, pag. 13. cited by Dr. *Stillingfleet* in his *Irenicum*, pag. 395.

*Ans.* We credibly suppose that such men as *Cranmer, Usher, Grindal, Abbot, Latimer, Ridley, Hooper, Jewel, Downam, Babington, Brownrig, Davenant, Hall, Morton, &c.* Bishops and Archbishops in Gods Church, not to mention those of other Nations and Countries, were humble and godly men. They were men of like passions with others, no doubt but they had their infirmities as all have



in this World : But if we affirm them to be guilty of any such Vice, as shall make them no Saints, I believe we shall leave few Saints in all the World. Sure then they could not be chargeable with any extraordinary and transcendent Vice. If *secundum sub & supra* be contrary to nature and Religion, then it is also contrary to all just Composition and Agreement. For men cannot by their Agreements legitimate Vice, and make that which is in it self a transcendent evil, to become a laudable or harmless good. God himself, I may speak it with reverence, cannot license men to be proud. It is certain, that no man is God. It is as certain, that Children are not by office Parents, and that when God made *Moses* Chief Ruler over *Israel*, and *David* King, he did not make any thing evil, or appoint them to any Vice at all, much less a transcendent one. If nature and Religion have no hand in this Heraldry of *secundum sub & supra*, then belike the body is as fit to rule the Soul as the Soul it, and Beasts must be equal with men, and the Image of God upon man consisting in wisdom and holiness, and Heavenly Rule, is rather wickedness and diabolism than the Image of God, and it was well done in *Corah* to affect the Priesthood, and he suffered wrongfully for his so doing. Is all superiority among men, save what grows by compact, evil? Cannot men be Superiours and Rulers, and yet very humble? And may not subjects and inferiours be very insolent, sawcy, proud, rebellious, discontented, seditious, affecting principality and domination?

The truth is, there can be no Government at all without *sub & supra*, some to govern and some to

to be governed, though all, both Governours and governed be infinitely below God, and are subject to his supream Government in an absolute, unlimited, and incommunicable sense.

They say the Turkish Empire is greater than all the Christian World. Suppose the Turkish Emperour should turn Christian, and be as another *Melchisedeck*, Priest and King, sole Emperour of all his Empire under God, and chief, not sole Bishop, *Episcopus prime sedis*, if in all other points he were a right good man, and only this could be objected against him, who can prove it to be flatly sinful? or if sinful, it is far from being that great sin of invading the office and sovereignty of Christ. Every infirmity or imprudence in Government, is not a transcendent Vice. Well then, lay all things together, and let each one judge of the cause of Episcopacy, and particularly of the English Episcopacy. 1. It doth not stand by the meer will and appointment of the Magistrate. It is a thing well becoming the Magistrate to establish as godly and profitable for the Church. 2. Accordingly the Magistrate doth by his civil Sanction establish it, as a nursing Father to the Church, and the English Episcopacy is a part of the municipal Laws of the Kingdom, it is if I mistake not a part of *magna Charta*, which hath been solemnly sworn to and confirmed by many Parliaments, and every King of *England* is sworn at his Coronation to confirm the Rights of the Church, and not to alter the Fundamental Laws, Sanctions, and usages of the Kingdom. 3. I grant that what is not Gods, the civil supream power may meddle with. But what is Gods, and the right

thereof is in him, they may not meddle with. After vows there is no making enquiry. I grant that Charity is the supream Law, and that all things must give place to Gods Glory, and the universal good of Souls, and that *codem modo quo quid constituitur dissolvitur*. But by the Laws and Sanctions of this Kingdom, Bishops and Archbishops have a true and lawful propriety in their places, maintenance, and possessions, as other Ministers and the rest of the Kings Subjects have in theirs. Either they have propriety or not. If not, there is a flaw in our Laws, yea the very Fundamental Laws of the Kingdom, and the Government of the Nation is unhinged, and made to stand upon a loose foundation which every man may alter, invade, and remove at his pleasure, and no man can be sure of any thing he hath, or call any thing he hath his own. If they have propriety, then it cannot be taken from them without an Act of Parliament, and joint Consent of King, Lords and Commons. And consequently the late solemn League and Covenant for the extirpating of Bishops and Archbishops, was so far from being godly and according to the just rules of Reformation, that it was in a high degree against the Laws of God and the standing municipal Laws, Sanctions and usages of this famous Kingdom, renowned throughout all the Christian World, though as against God we have cause to lie in dust and ashes, and repent and abhor our selves for our manifold abominations and crying sins.

It is a Rule in Law, *In aquali jure melior est conditio possidentis*. Episcopacy, to say no more, is upon even ground with all those Forms of Government

vernment which hitherto by one or other have been projected and contrived in any Age of the Church. But more than so, it is the ancient right and inheritance of this Kingdom, time out of mind, and for plea I may use *Jephtha's* words, *Judg. 11. 26. While Israel dwelt in Heshbon and her Towns, and in Aroer and her Towns, and in all the Cities that be along by the Coast of Arnon, three hundred years? why therefore did ye not recover them within that time?* Antiquity, and Custom, and Possession, are no plea against the will and Command of God: But where the right is equal, and one only can have the thing in question, the Law will adjudge it to him who is in possession, that so there may be an end of suits and contentions, and mens inheritances may be sure to them.

If there be any thing affixed by the Magistrate to the office of English Bishops and Archbishops, as an appendant, which doth not so well suit with their office, and is meerly of civil Constitution, and which may be altered and taken from them without abolishing the substance of their office, it lies in the breast of supream authority to alter, confirm, and do as they see good; it is supposed that if there be no alteration, the thing in it self is not simply evil; and if the toleration of it be better than abolition, it is better to let it be as it is. I do not hereby mean the rigid pressing of Ceremonies, and subscription to doubtful controverted matters. Those are points of another nature. It was the Prediction of *Padre Paulo*, that the Church of *England* would then find the inconveniency of Episcopacy, when a high-spirited Bishop should once come to rule that Church; and *Beza*  
 E 4 when

when he had freed the Bishops of the Reformation from that imputation of *lording it over their brethren*, which he had charged the Roman Bishops with, yet he adds, that he would beg them rather to lay down their power, than to transmit that power to those after them, who it may be were not like to succeed them in their meekness and moderation. Dr. *Stillingsfleet* in his *Irenicum*, pag. 409. This Prediction hath been fulfilled but too often. But the question is not what is the Disease, but what is the remedy. How will you cure this inconvenience? A thousand to one every High Priest in *Judea* will not prove an *Aaron* and a *Jehojada*, nor every King of *Israel* a *David*, and an *Hezekiah*, nor every Lord Chief Justice of *England* a *Sir Matthew Hales*. So that I know no remedy; where the Magistrate shall sinfully tolerate abuses, better than patience and meekness, every man to keep in his rank and place, to do his own duty, to go as far as he can in reforming others, submitting and obeying so far as we may with a good Conscience, and where we cannot obey men without disobeying God, meekly and patiently to suffer.

To say that the way of Church-Government by Diocesan Prelates and Super-intendents, as superiors in office to Presbyters, hath no inconveniencies, is to say that which may not be said of any way in the World that is not immediately and in all points divine. And even when things divine are done by frail and weak men, as all men more or less are, they favour of the Cask, humane infirmity cleaves to them, and even the best things are corrupted by men, and so grow worst.

But



But the way which Mr. *Baxter* offers seems to be a worse way, and to have more inconveniencies, it is the way of rigid Independency. Those of the Presbyterian way are for a Classis of Ministers, or Presbytery, like to that at *Geneva*, an Ecclesiastical Senate containing City and Territories, or Market Town and Neighbour Circumjacent Villages, and that Senate to have a President in it : whether that President should be for life, or only by course, Mr. *Calvin* and *Beza* judged it an accidental and mutable thing : but that there should be one, they thought it essential and necessary. *Calv. Inst. l. 4. c. 4. sect. 2. Beza de Ministr. grad. cap. 23. p. 153. & cap. 24. p. 167.* and saith Mr. *Calvin* upon *Tit. 1. 5.* of the Apostles times, *non eam fuisse tunc aequalitatem inter Ecclesiae Ministros, quin unus aliquis autoritate & consilio praeset.* There was no such equality among the Ministers of the Church, but that some one was over the rest in Authority and Counsel. Considerable is that of *Zanchy* in 4. *Præcept. p. 338. Si Ecclesia aliqua exigua sit, & non multis eruditis hominibus constans, non debet Excommunicationem ferre, nisi vicinioribus consultis Ecclesiis. Profecto neq; Chirurgus, si sit timens Dei & prudens, scindit alicui manum aut brachium, nisi audiat prius vicinorum etiam peritorum medicorum judicium atq; sententiam.* Concurrent herewith you may see the judgment of the English Non-Conformists, those of the Presbyterian way as differing from Prelates and Independents, laid down by one of that way in a late Pamphlet, Entituled *English Presbytery, pag. 8.* I wonder (saith a great Anti-Episcopal Divine) that men that have been bred in an University should

should explode and scoff at a Collegiate Government by a Colledge of Pastors and a President. Mr. *Baxter* doth often in his Writings cite a saying of *Ignatius* with seeming approbation, To every Church one Bishop with Presbyters and Deacons. And all Divines that write against Bishops do confess that soon after the Apostles days some one of the Pastors, by way of eminency, was called Bishop. Even in those first Ages of the Church, when the Church was in Persecution under Pagan Princes unto the time of *Constantine*, there were Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons, there was some imparity then between the Bishop and the Presbyter ; and those are counted the best and purest times of the Church next to those of the Apostles. It is not agreed indeed among Divines, whether they were Diocesan or Parochial Bishops ; but this all sides agree in, That there was a distinction between Bishops and Presbyters, and that Bishops had some pre-eminence, rule and dignity, more than Presbyters had. *Cyprian*, of all the Ancients, was far from proud superiority and lording it over either the people or the Presbyters, *A primordio Episcopatus mei, statui, nihil sine consilio vestro, & sine consensu Plebis, mea privatim sententia gerere* ; in the end of the tenth Epistle of his third Book. There was in his time as exact Government and Discipline as we shall read of in any age since the Apostles time: so much is confessed by the Writers against Episcopacy. Yet *Cyprian* was a just maintainer of his own and his Brethrens rights, he was more than a bare Presbyter. He being chosen *Præpositus* or President of the Presbytery, took it

to heart that they contemned and reviled him whom they had chosen to be their *præpositus* Provost or President, and that the Presbyters did challenge the whole Authority and reserve it to themselves; whereas they were not a Presbytery without their President: *Quod nunquam omnino sub antecessoribus factum est, ut cum contumelia & contemptu præpositi totum sibi vendicent Presbyteri.* So are *Cyprian's* words. Read but *Dr. Stillingfleet's* last Chapter of his *Irenicum*, and you may see the most famous lights of the Reformed Churches approving the Presidency and Superintendency of some Minister over many, not only as lawful, but as profitable and expedient. So that *Mr. Baxter's* Judgment in this is against the stream of the best and wisest Divines that have been in the Church of God for more than fifteen hundred years. There are but three main Parties who contend about Church Government, the Episcopal, the Presbyterians, the Independents. The two former are more than a thousand for one to the other. The Independents are but a late Sect. *Mr. Baxter* in this is a down right Independent, this being one of their Principles, That all Ministers are to have equal office, and every Congregation is to be an independent Body or Corporation, consisting of Officers and Members, and is to have a compleat Jurisdiction within it self, every Parish is to be a Bishoprick, the Pastor is to be Bishop thereof, and there are to be joined to him a sort of men called ruling Elders, with Deacons. And they be equally against a Presbytery or *Classis* of neighbour Pastours with a President or Moderator, as against Bishops.

Bishops. All Pastors are to be equal in office, though not equal in gifts. I do only take notice here that this their way and judgment is against the judgment and practice of the greatest, best and soundest part of Gods Church to this day; and *quoad hominem* Mr. Baxter's Judgment is contradictory to himself.

Indeed, Mr. Baxter in all his Writings seems to be against the Office of Lay-Elders, or mere ruling Elders, as they are called. But that he is not for them under another notion, as Heads and Delegates of the People, mutually chosen by the Pastor and people for assistance in Discipline, may be doubted. He seems to hint at some such thing in his Epistle before Mr. Wadsworth's last Sermons. Sure I am, that in a certain Book printed 1658. called, *A true account of what was done by a Church of Christ in Exon, (whereof Mr. Lewis Stuckley is Pastor)* there is set down two forms of Church-Covenants, the one to make one a Member of the Church Universal, the other to make or declare one a Member of the Church particular at *Exon*. And in this latter the people oblige themselves among other things to submit to the teaching and ministerial guidance of Mr. *Stuckley* as Pastor; and to the oversight of Mr. N. E. Mr. H. R. and two more ruling according to Gods word. And the Pastor and four Elders did reciprocally on their part subscribe and covenant, page 39, 40. Then follows —  
 “Now by reason of the agreement that is between this profession, and the profession of several Churches of Christ in *Worcestershire*; I shall in the next place transcribe out of Mr. Baxter's  
 “Christian

"Christian Concord, some observations of his,  
 "concerning this profession of theirs, page 41.

I have not Mr. *Baxter's* Christian Concord by me, nor do I remember that I have seen it. If his way be Mr. *Stuckley's* way, it is rigid Independency, and the setting up of mere ruling Elders in the Church. If it be not, I do not affirm it of him. As to that point of two Church-Covenants, I know it is his way and judgment. I will not interrupt the present Discourse to meddle with that, though I have no little to say against it.

The present Question is not, Whether every Congregation shall be duly and godlily governed; but whether all Pastors and Ministers are to be equal in office, though not equal in gifts, and there is to be the same equality among them as among Jurors, where one only is Foreman, and scarce that; and whether a few Independent Ministers, unsound in many Church-Points and Principles, not heard of till yesterday, be to be regarded in this before the constant unanimous judgment and settled practice of all the best and soundest Divines in Gods Church to this day; and whether part of Mr. *Baxter's* Contradiction it is that we must adhere to, that for the Independents, or that against them.

The only considerable Party then against the state and office of Bishops as superior to Presbyters, is those of the Presbyterian way, who adhere to *Hierome's* opinion, That by Gods Law there is no difference between Bishops and Presbyters, and that in the Apostles times the Churches were governed *communi Presbyterorum consilio*.

Now



Now saith Mr. *Thomas Hooker* in his survey, part 2. page 6. *The Church of Scotland complains bitterly, That a constant Moderator made way for a Bishop, and so for the bane of their Churches.* It seems by this they are so afraid of the thing *Bishop*, that for fear of it they are ready almost to lay aside their Presbytery. You make the President or Moderator to be essential to your Presbytery, but for fear he should prove a Tyrant, and pull all in pieces, you would have him not to be constant, but to be changeable, for a year or so, or *durante beneplacito*. But I conceive this to be against the rules of Government in the General. *My son, fear thou the Lord and the King, and meddle not with them that are given to change,* Prov. 24. 21. It is of the Law of Nature, that we never change but for the better. Unchangeableness is the perfection of God, and we are bidden to be perfect as our heavenly Father is perfect. Change for the better, and spare not. The Independents would have their ruling Elders to be for life, Mr. *Cotton's way of the Churches in New-England*, Chap. 7. Sect. 2. Pag. 114. There was a time in *England* when it was complained of as a State-grievance, That the Judges Commissions ran but *durante beneplacito*; and it was thought a priviledg and benefit for the State when they were altered, and made to run *quamdiu se bene gesserint*. So is the true institution of Government, rather than the contrary. For in annual Changes there must needs be many a Change for the worse, but when you have once light upon an eminent man, you cannot keep him too long: O what a loss is it when an eminent Church-Gover-

nour or Commonwealth-Governour dies! Must people change their Pastours yearly? That would not do well. Must the people and Presbyters at *Carthage*, change their eminent Bishop, Superintendent or President *Cyprian* at the years end, for fear lest if he stay in longer, he will ruine all the Churches by his tyranny and insolent domination?

St. *Jerome*, that prime maintainer of the equality of Bishops and Presbyters by Divine Law, is thought in one passage to have contradicted himself, and given his own opinion a deep wound, when he saith in his known Epistle to *Evagrius*, Ep. 85. *Et ut sciamus Traditiones Apostolicas sumptas de veteri Testamento, Quod Aaron & Filii ejus atque Levitæ in Templo fuerunt; hoc sibi Episcopi & Presbyteri atque Diaconi vendicent in Ecclesia.* From which words Dr. *Hammond* in his *Dissert. 2. Chap. 28.* questions not but to make *Hierome* either apparently contradictory to himself, or else to assert, That the superiority of Bishops over Presbyters was by his Confession an Apostolical Tradition: for saith he, *Nihil manifestius dici potuit:* And S. 2. he confesses, He sees not what can be answered to it, or by what way so clear an affirmation can be evaded. Dr. *Stillingfleet* in his *Irenicum*, pag. 265, 266, 267, 268. hath endeavoured to clear the words of *Hierome* from all shew of contradiction. The Doctors words are these, pag. 268. —“The plain meaning then of *Hierome* is no more but this, That as *Aaron* and his Sons in the order of Priesthood were above the Levites under the Law; so the Bishops and Presbyters in the order

"der of the Evangelical Priesthood are above the  
 "Deacons under the Gospel. For the Compari-  
 "son runs not between *Aaron* and his Sons un-  
 "der the Law, and Bishops and Presbyters under  
 "the Gospel; but between *Aaron* and his Sons,  
 "as one part of the Comparison under the Law,  
 "and the Levites under them, as the other: so  
 "under the Gospel, Bishops and Presbyters  
 "make one part of the Comparison, answering  
 "to *Aaron* and his Sons in that wherein they all  
 "agree, (*viz.*) the order of Priesthood; and the  
 "other part under the Gospel is that of Dea-  
 "cons, answering to the Levites under the Law.  
 So far he.

Unto which I answer, That if this be *Jerome's*  
 meaning, his meaning is wrong, and his assertion  
 must be according to what *Dr. Hammond* collects,  
 or it cannot stand. For Deacons under the Go-  
 spel do not answer to Levites under the Law.  
 There was a time when Deacons were not: and  
 they were chosen only upon a special occasion, *Act.*  
*6.* When the number of the disciples was mul-  
 tiplied, and the Apostles could not both look to  
 the poor and do servile offices, and intend the  
 work of prayer and preaching the Gospel too,  
 they chose seven men for Deacons to ease them of  
 some part of their work, consisting in serving  
 Tables. But before Deacons were, there were  
 Presbyters and Apostles. The office of Dea-  
 cons was but accidental and emergent, on suppo-  
 sition that the Apostles, Pastors and Presbyters  
 were so taken up with the work of prayer and  
 preaching, and things more nearly concerning  
 the Soul, and the interest of the Church, that  
 they

they could not divert themselves to serve tables. So that where the Pastors and Presbyters could well do all the work, there was no need of Deacons as a Divine Office under the Presbyters. *Act. 14. 22. They ordained them elders in every Church.* It is not said that they ordained them Deacons in every Church too. *Tit. 1. 5. Ordain elders in every City.* He doth not say ordain Deacons too. For *Cessante ratione legis cessat & lex.* Where there is no use for Deacons, as in small Parishes and Congregations, where the Pastor or Presbyter may well do all the work, there no Deacons are to be. And accordingly we see that Deacons are but here and there, in great Churches. But the greater part of Congregations have no Deacons at all, unless you will call Overseers of the Poor, appointed by the Magistrate, and chosen yearly for each town, Deacons. These indeed are in every town, and it is a worthy constitution of the Magistrate. But I suppose none will think that *Jerome* intended his assertion of such men as the Overseers for the poor yearly chosen with us are. He intended such Deacons as are set apart by solemn ordination for an Office and Function in the Church, according to *Act. 6. 3. Phil. 1. 1. 1 Tim. 3. 8, 12, 13.* But now the comparison between such Deacons under the Gospel and the Levites under the Law cannot hold. For the Levites were men set apart for the ministry. They were not under *Aaron* and his Sons as Deacons be under Presbyters. They were dispersed throughout all the Tribes, according to that famous prediction of *Jacob* their Father, *I will divide them in Jacob and scatter them in Israel, Gen.*

49. 7. And of the Tribe of *Levi* it is said, they shall teach *Jacob* thy judgments, and *Israel* thy law: they shall put incense before thee, and whole burnt sacrifices upon thine altar. *Deut.* 33. 8, 10. My Covenant was with *Levi*, saith the Lord of hosts, of life and peace, and I gave them to him, for the fear wherewith he feared me, and was afraid before my name. The law of truth was in his mouth, and iniquity was not found in his lips: he walked with me in peace and equity, and did turn many away from iniquity, *Mal.* 2. 4, 5, 6. It is true the Scripture doth all along distinguish the Priests from the Levites. That hinders not but that many of the Levites might be placed as fixed Pastors and Presbyters in the several Synagogues throughout all the twelve Tribes. For it is evident from Scripture that the Jews had Synagogues all the land over, in these Synagogues were placed Ministers of the Sacred Tribe. Of this Tribe the Levites were a great part, the Priests as distinguished from the Levites were not half enough to do all the teaching and Pastoral work in all the Synagogues all the land over. It is not to be doubted but that many of the Levites were employed as ordinary Pastors and teachers. In a famous solemn assembly for humiliation, fasting and prayer, we find most eminent men Levites together with *Ezra* the Priest, teaching the people, confessing sin, humbling themselves and solemnly covenanting with God, and all the Congregation joyning with them, *Nehem.* 8. 9, 11, 12, 13. *Chap.* 9. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. The Jews sent Priests and Levites, (as men of note and eminency) to *John*, to know of him who he was, *Joh.* 1. 19. *Barnabas* was a Levite, a prime man



man in the Church, a teacher or Presbyter, yet and more than a Presbyter, he was a kind of Evangelist or general Minister, *Act. 4. 36. Act. 14. 22, 23, 24, 25, 26.* Besides Priests and Levites, they had Singers, Porters, Nethinims, hewers of wood and drawers of water for the congregation, *Exod. 7. 24. Neh. 11. 3. 2 Chr. 17. 8, 9, 10.*

They were Levites whom *Jehosaphat* sent to teach in the Cities of *Judah*, as well as Priests; nine Levites and two Priests. In two places God commands, Take heed to thy self, that thou forsake not the Levite as long as thou livest upon the earth: for he hath no part nor inheritance with thee, *Deut. 12. 19. Deut. 14. 27.* see *Num. 3.* and *Num. 8.* with *Num. 18.* and *Exod. 28.* Nothing is more plain than that the Priests the Sons of *Aaron* were a distinct order from the Levites. Deacons cannot succeed into the order of Levites. The Levites were teaching Elders and Pastors, a part of the settled standing ministry of *Judaen*. And Christ came not to abolish the distinction between them, further than what was typical and purely Mosaical. It is of *Levi* that God saith, *Bless, Lord, his substance, and accept the work of his hands: smite through the loins of them that rise against him, and of them that hate him, that they rise not again, Deut. 33. 11.* Now they that would level the Jewish Levites with Gospel-Deacons, they do not do right to the Levites. For the Levites were by office and calling equal to Pastors and Teachers, and rulers of the Synagogue, they were set apart for the sacred Office in ordinary, and their maintenance was sacred. The Lord was their portion, they had a serpor-

tion allotted them by God out of all the Tyths and Offerings and Sacrifices of the people, and Cities and Suburbs and places of aboad up and down the land. And when ten Tribes were rent from the house of *David*, *Jeroboam* cast off the Levites from being Priests unto the Lord : wherefore the Priests and the Levites that were in all *Israel*, resorted to the house of *David* out of all their Coasts, *2 Chr.* 11. 13, 14. Saith God, *Phinehas* the son of *Eleazar*, the son of *Aaron* the Priest, shall have an everlasting Priesthood, *Num.* 25. 11, 12, 13. *The Levites*, saith God, *shall be ministers in my Sanctuary*, *Ezek.* 44. 10, 11. He doth there limit and set down the Office and charge of the Levites, *v.* 10, 11, 12, 13, 14. from thence to the end of the Chapter is the Office and charge of the Priests. *1 Chr.* 15. 12. Ye are the chief of the fathers of the Levites. *v.* 14. The Priests and the Levites sanctified themselves. Finally two principal parts of the ministerial Office under the Law were teaching and Sacrifice, as under the Gospel teaching and Sacraments. The Levites were employed in both the former : so that the Presbyters Office doth rather answer to the Levites, and the Bishops Office to the Priests. As for Deacons, they are an office partly by the by, necessary only *pro hic & nunc* as there is occasion.

Now let us suppose all the Priests and Levites throughout *Judea* embracing the Gospel of Christ. Doth the Gospel destroy the dignity and preeminence of the Priest above the Levite? What was Typical and purely Mosaical, the Gospel doth abolish : but more it doth not. If the Levites, who before the coming of Christ were holy  
and

and faithful teachers and pastors and rulers of Synagogues and guides of Souls in the holy land, by embracing the Gospel be turned into Deacons, and lose both honour and Office, that cannot stand with the honour and interest of the Gospel, that would make the law and Gospel to be at odds with each other. And if the Priests the sons of *Aaron* by embracing the Gospel be turned into common Levites, and lose their Office and dignity, they may perhaps complain and say the Law and Gospel disagree.

The Gospel makes Jew and Gentile one. I grant that. But Jew and Gentile may be one in faith, in holiness, in all that is godly, and yet the Christianized Priest may be above the Christianized Levite, and have some more honour and Office in the Christian Church. The Priest and the Levite are in being, stated Church Officers before the Deacon is thought of: and therefore *Jerome* himself hath confuted *Jerome*, and left the cause of Presbyterian parity both dead and alive. Contradictions cannot be true. *Act. 6. 7.* we read that a great company of the Priests were obedient to the faith. *Act. 4. 36.* we read of *Barnabas* an eminent Christian Levite. Now I put this question, is not the Christian Priest above the Christian Levite both by the order of the Law and of the Gospel? This seems to be one main root and original of Bishops as superiour in Office and eminency to Presbyters. The Christian Religion finds two orders of Ministers settled in the Church by Divine Law, the Priest and the Levite. It takes down the wall of partition between Jew and Gentile, and making the Priest

and the Levite Christians, the one remains a Christian Priest in Gods Church, the other remains a Christian Levite; those we now call Presbyters do answer to the Levites, those we call Bishops do answer to the Priests, and the Arch-Bishop answers to *Aaron* the chief Priest among the Jews.

It is true the scripture saith, the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change of the Law, *Hebr. 7. 12.* But all things under the Law were not Typical and to be abolished. Many from hence would infer that tythes under the Gospel are not to be paid. But Divines do generally disown that assertion, and hold that tythes are not meerly Levitical, *Levi* himself, saith the text, paid tythes in *Abraham, v. 9.* That there be a diversity of orders and ministering Officers in the Church, is not a meer Levitical or Judaical ordinance: But it is founded in natural equity, and is according to the rules and principles of Government in the general. For a meer equality of Church-rulers, that no one have more Office than another, is but a running from one extreame to another, seeking to avoid Tyranny you run into Anarchy, which is the worse evil of the two as most think. It was the saying of a certain man, if we must have Bishops, it is better we have one in a County, than one in each parish, *procul à Jove procul à fulmine.* It is true, a single Parish Minister if he be evil, is not like to do so much evil to the Church as a single evil diocesan Bishop: but if you take down diocesan Bishops, and turn all the Churches into independent Congregations, and make every parish a Bishoprick, and

and every parish-Minister a Bishop, a few years experience will do more to shew the evil and deterioration thereof, than bare arguments will.

The main of all the arguments for the Independent-parity of Ministers under the Gospel, being soundly looked into, will be found equally of force to prove the same parity of ministers under the Law, which is to strike at the wisdom of God, and reprove our Maker of folly. All sound Divines confess the Scriptures to be a rule of faith and manners, as well for the government of Societies as persons. Now a Nation or Kingdom is a society of Persons. The grand Law of the Gospel is, Go and disciple all Nations, baptize and teach them to observe all my commands. The Kingdoms of this World, it is predicted, shall become the kingdoms of Christ. There is then in Scripture a pattern or institution for Christian Kings and Parliaments how to order their kingdoms, and rule all their subjects in holiness, unity and concord.

This pattern is extant in the old Testament. At the time when Christ spake those words to his Apostles, Go and teach all nations baptizing them, &c. *Mat.* 28. 19, 20. not one tittle of the New Testament was writ. And now that the New Testament is writ, we do not read of one entire Kingdom or Commonwealth that did embrace the Christian faith. And until the time of *Constantine* the great, which was near three hundred years after Christ, the Christian Religion had not one King or Monarch of the earth to be a nursing Father to the Church. Therefore Christian Kings and Monarchs are to look into the



Old Testament, and there they will find the model or form of a holy Commonwealth or Kingdom of Heavenly Saints and worshippers under most eminent governours, *Moses, Joshua*, the Judges and Kings of *Israel* and *Judah*, by the prescript of God himself. From whence they will be able to pick out this conclusion, that though the Jews had many things Typical, and proper to themselves, yet some things they had in common with others, as men, as rulers and ruled, as a Kingdom or Nation of holy Pilgrims and warriors against the world, the flesh and the Devil. And this among the rest; the wisdom of God saw it meet to set apart on purpose for the sacred Office, for teaching and sacrifice and holy government, these two orders of Priests and Levites, *Aaron* and his Sons the Priests, and the Levites under and with them. The Gospel takes not down the natural equity of this order and institution. For out of *Zion* shall go forth the Law, and the word of the Lord from *Jerusalem*, *Isa.* 2. 3. what Law? Why the Law of faith and repentance, the Law of governing persons and Societies, the Law of ruling Nations and Kingdoms to the worlds end. And accordingly, the Christian Church is formed after the Jewish model. For what are all particular Churches or Congregations but as so many Christian Synagogues? And what are all Parish Ministers, Pastors and Presbyters, but as so many Rulers of those Synagogues, answering to what we find in the New Testament to have been the order and constitution of the Jews? as *Act.* 13. 15. *Act.* 18. 8. *Mar.* 5. 22. *Mat.* 9. 18. *Luk.* 13. 14. What are Bishops, but as so many

many Christian Priests somewhat above the Levites in Office and dignity? Dr. *James Usher* Primate and Metropolitan of *Ireland* is as another *Jehojada*. *Constantine* is as another *David* or *Jehoshaphat*. Whence should the distinction of Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons get into the Church so soon as the Apostles eyes were laid to sleep, and continue all along to the time of *Constantine*, in the heat of persecution, if not hence, that the Jewish Levites became Christian teachers, and Presbyters, and the Jewish Priests became Christian Bishops, and the Jewish Synagogues became Christian Churches? This was no blending of Judaism and Christianity, and a mixing of dross with silver, but it was a just fulfilling of that ancient Law or Prophecy, The Law shall go forth of *Zion*, and the word of the Lord from *Jerusalem*, and it was the uniting of Jew and Gentile in one, and an engrafting of believing Gentiles and Christian Profelytes into the faith of *Abraham*, who is deservedly called the Father of the faithful. We cannot reasonably think that the Primitive Churches, Pastors and people, the immediate successors of the Apostles, renowned throughout all the Christian world for their piety, patience, self-denial and all other Christian graces, even to the laying down of their lives for Christ, should so early and so universally and without any scruple or contradiction give way to the distinction of Bishops and Presbyters, and ascribe some more Office and Dignity to the one than to the other, if they had not conceived it to have some foundation in Gods word, to be by the direction and constitution of the Apostles, or some other way

way divine. Episcopacy then did not stand by worldly Princes and Parliaments, but by its own intrinsic goodness, and by the word of God, and by a superior Law than that of man and meer Custom. Presbyters were but meanly learned in those days many of them, the Bishops did excel them in learning and in teaching and in Episcopal diligence, and were beloved by all.

Mr *Diodati* in his Analysis upon *Luke* saith that the seventy disciples mentioned *Luk. 10. 1.* were a distinct order from the Apostles, and inferiour to them: Christ in his Apostles laying the foundation of Episcopacy; and in the seventy laying the foundation of the Presbytery.

*Obj.* If any shall say that this confutes what is before argued from the priesthood under the Law, and that it is more honourable to make Bishops the successors of the Apostles, and Presbyters of the seventy Disciples, than of the Priests and Levites under the Law. *Ans.* This is not destructive of the foregoing Doctrine, but supposing Mr *Diodati's* opinion sound, it is as another rise and concurrent foundation of Episcopacy. It makes for the main cause.

*Obj.* It hath been observed that while Bishops claimed preeminence above Presbyters by custom of the Church, as of old, or by the favour of the Prince, as of later days; they stood even in great storms: but when they would settle it on a new bottom, entitle God to it immediately; it was not long after the return of light, but it came tumbling down, saith one whom I may not name. And to my remembrance *Maresius* in his examen of some positions of Dr. *Prideaux* calls Dr. *Ham-*

*mond*

mond no better than *Nebulo* because of his dissertations for Episcopacy. *Ans.* The Impugners of the Divine right of Episcopacy ground themselves upon the reasons of *St. Jerome*. The maintainers of Episcopacy produce *S. Jeromes* reasons against himself. It is left to the impartial Reader to judge in his own breast. If by just and honest right Episcopacy stand, it will not much advantage their cause who say it is not by Divine right. If Episcopacy were not of God, it had hardly stood so long in so many and great storms. It is not the bare assertion that Episcopacy is by Divine right, and simple, modest and peaceable disputes for the same, that hath been the fall of Episcopacy. How is Episcopacy bath falln as *David* saith of *Abner*, *as a man falleth before wicked men, so fellest thou?* such a fall is rather honourable than not. A threefold cord is not easily broken. Episcopacy hath this threefold cord. 1. Its own goodness. 2. Prescription.

3. The municipal Laws of the land. *Concessimus* *Duo* & *hac presenti Charta confirmationis pro nobis & heredibus nostris in perpetuum, quod Ecclesia Anglica libera sit, & habeat omnia jura sua integra & libertates suas illas, &c.* *Magna Charta c. 1.*

*Obj.* Against Prelacy *Dr. Cbeynel* in a Book of his called, *The second part of the Undecavuer*, pag. 2. argueth thus; "The Church of England cannot be a free Church, if the Prelates be suffered to Lord it over the Ministers and people of God in England, and therefore the King is bound according to the great Charter to extirpate Prelacy. *Ans.* A bold assertion and unsound, Bishop *Banner* lords it over Gods heritage,

rage, and causes to be put to death many  
 faithful Souls, therefore the King is bound to  
 extirpate his Office, and to extirpate all godly  
 Bishops too, as *Cranmer, Latimer, Ridley, Hooper,*  
*Farrier, &c.* is this good reasoning? The Pres-  
 byters in *Cyprian's* time revile and contemn  
*Cyprian* their eminent and godly Bishop and pre-  
 sident, therefore the King is bound to extirpate  
 both Presbyters and Presbytery, is this to reason  
 soundly? did the authors and founders of *Magna*  
*Charta* think Prelacy to be evil, and such an evil  
 as the King and Parliament are bound to extir-  
 pate? Have the Kings and Parliaments of *Eng-*  
*land*, or the Judges and Lawyers of *England*,  
 particularly my Lord *Coke* in the second part of  
 his *Institutes*, so expounded *Magna Charta*, as to  
 think the King and State obliged, as this Do-  
 ctour saith, to extirpate English Prelates and Pre-  
 lacy? You must prove what you can never prove,  
 or *Magna Carta* will overthrow your Solemn  
 League and Covenant, and all your defences  
 thereof will be worse than nothing. You must  
 prove that the Office and institution of Prelacy  
 is evil, yea more than evil, such an evil as the  
 King is bound to extirpate. For he is not bound  
 to extirpate all the evils in Church and State. He  
 is bound to consent to no evil: but he is bound  
 to tolerate many a one, or else there will be no  
 Kingdom, and we must all go out of the world,  
 and not tolerate our selves. And you must prove  
 that all the English Prelates are intolerably bad  
 and scandalous, and that it is by reason of the  
 Office of Prelacy that they are so. But now if  
 the institution of Prelacy be lawful and profit-  
 able



table for the Church, and if many of the *Eng-  
lish* Prelates be learned and godly, and the rights  
of Prelacy be confirmed by the great Charter of  
*England*, then all you can say in defence of the  
Solemn League and Covenant, and the extirpa-  
tion of Prelacy, will not serve, your own words  
will rebound upon you, pag. 3. *He that hath sworn  
rashly, must repent deliberately, and not perform his  
Oath wickedly after he is convinced of the sinfulness  
of his Oath.*

*Obj.* Christ hath appointed five and but five Offi-  
cers in his Church, meer ruling Elders, Pastors,  
Doctors, Deacons, Deaconesses or Widows,  
may no more be added or lawfully tolerated?  
no, in no wise; the rule is sure, from which we  
must not depart, no not a hairs breadth, thou shalt  
add nothing thereunto, take nothing therefrom.  
As for Surrogates, Chancellours, Deans, Arch-  
deacons, they are for the building up of the  
kingdom of darkness, and have been the Brokers  
and maintainers of all that hideous wickedness,  
which hath been vented in the Doctrines and opi-  
nions that have acted in the lives and conversa-  
tions of that hellish crew, that have had their  
dependence upon the Man of sin. *M<sup>r</sup> Thomas  
Hooker in his Survey part. 2. c. 1. pag. 4, 5, 6.*

*Ans.* Either it is the name or the thing or  
both in these Officers that you charge so heavily.  
If nothing but the name offend, you offend more  
in calling them by such hard names. Must we  
use no names but what we find in Scripture?  
*Dr. John Rainolds* proves it neither unlawful nor  
unexpedient to use the words Christmas, Can-  
dlemas, Michaelmas, &c. in the places where we  
live,

live, and where the names are innocently, familiarly and customably used; in his Sermons upon *Haggai*, Sermon first, pag. 8, 9, 10. And he and others no friends to Popery and Idolatry, judge it neither unlawful nor unexpedient to say, Monday, Tuesday, &c. And yet these names are more lyable to exception than those here named by Mr. T. Hooker. Either they are Scriptural, or they are not contrary to Scripture. They are in familiar use, they are as lawful as multitudes of words taken up by Divines and private Christians and Ecclesiastical writers, no wise man will make a controverſie of innocent and allowable words.

It must be the thing you be against or nothing. As for the thing, there is none of all these whom you do so heavily charge, but, if your position be right, they will be found to come within the compass of your own Divine Officers, Ruling Elders, Pastors, Doctors, Deacons, some one or more of these. If they be no more, they are Ruling Elders. Methinks those who rigidly contend for the Divine Right of Ruling Elders commonly called Lay Elders as a stated constant Officer in Gods Church, should have little to say against any of the Officers before so heavily taxed, and particularly Chancellours. If you can like one in every Parish, why cannot you like one in a Diocess? I meet with no one Independent Author, and I have seen a considerable number, who doth not contend for the Office of meer Ruling Elders in the Church as necessary by Divine Law. So also is the judgment of the Presbyterians: Inasmuch that they wonder the Bishops should be  
for

for Lay-Chancellors, and not for Lay-Elders. Saith Mr. *Thomas Hooker*, speaking of the Office of Ruling Elders, appointed by Christ, "This cause hath been maintained by many of Christs Worthies of former, and now of later times; and now at last, by those two famous and eminent Champions, Mr. *Rutherford* and Mr. *Gillespie*. So that we have no controversie here but with Hierarchical persons, the force and power of whose arguments lies especially in a Pursivant and a Prison, armed with Authority of an high Commission, *Survey part. 2. pag. 8.* Afterwards he lays down the order and process of Church censures, witnesses being examined, and all things prepared and made ready for sentence, *The sentence is to be solemnly passed and pronounced upon the Delinquent by the Ruling Elder, whether it be the sentence of admonition or excommunication, ib. pag. 38.*

Now would any man think, that these persons should inveigh against the Office of English Lay-Chancellors, as Anti-Christian and hellish, having only or chief dependence upon the Man of sin? But I will leave them to defend and make good their own way. If it stand, the cause of Lay-Chancellors will stand with it. If it do not stand, the cause of Lay-Chancellors duly bounded and managed will not fall with it. As for Surrogates, we have *Paul* appointing *Titus* to ordain Elders in every City, and to set in order such things as were wanting, *Tit. 1. 5.* Thus in this case did not do Ministerial authoritative acts in *Pauls* name, but in Christs name: yet was he Ministerially called and appointed hereto by *Paul*.

I grant that acts of jurisdiction and authority cannot in an ordinary way be done by one that hath no authority: also I grant that Bishops, Pastors and Ministers cannot go to Heaven by deputies. He that does the work is to have the reward. But if a Minister be sick, or have call to go from home, he may honestly get one to supply his place, and both Preach and Baptize and give the Lords Supper, and do all other acts and Offices for him in his Congregation, till he be recovered, or returned. And what is this but the making of a Surrogare or Substitute? The thing it self is lawful and in common practice with all good men. Let us not then fall out for the meer word.

*Obj.* The Parish-Ministers are but as Lictors and Serjeants to the Chancellors. *Ans.* And are they not so to the Independant and Presbyterian Lay-Elders? I hope you will not think it below the Parish-Ministers, or the Bishop, or an Apostle, to be Lictors and Serjeants to Jesus Christ? Prove that the Parish-Ministers of *England* with respect to the Bishops Courts justly moderated are any more than lawful Lictors and Serjeants and obedient Servants to Jesus Christ? *2 Chr. 19. 8.* In Jerusalem did Jehosaphat set of the Levites, and of the Priests, and of the chief of the Fathers of Israel; for the judgment of the Lord, and for controversies, when they returned to Jerusalem. In imitation hereof the King and State set Chancellours in every Diocess, to be for Ecclesiastical Judges, for the decision of Church-causes, and the assistance of the Bishop and Parish-Ministers in their Office, *ne quid detrimenti Ecclesia capiat,*  
limiting

limiting their Office and Jurisdiction to causes Ecclesiastical, Testamentary, and Matrimonial, and denying them the power of the Sword and coercive punishment.

*Obj.* The Chancellor takes on him to Excommunicate.

*Ans.* He takes on him *secundum allegata & probata*, to give Sentence in Causes depending before him as an Ecclesiastical Judge, and to Decree Excommunication. *Solomon* deposed *Abiathar*: and if *Solomon* had deputed a Consistory of wise and able persons to have examined his Case, and given Sentence in it, how prove you this to be unlawful?

*Obj.* Unto whom it belongeth to take in, unto them it belongeth to cast out. And those which are to publish the Excommunication are to decree it. *Ans.* Those which are to publish it juridically, are to be lawful Authorized Ministers, and they are to have just reason and evidence for what they do. But that they must also Decree it, remains to be proved, *Ezra* 10. 7, 8. *They made Proclamation throughout Judah and Jerusalem, unto all the Children of the Captivity, that they should gather themselves together unto Jerusalem: And that whosoever would not come within three days, according to the Counsel of the Princes and the Elders, all his substance should be forfeited, and himself separated from the Congregation of those that had been carried away.* 1. This was a Godly Decree as is evident from the whole Context. 2. It was a Decree with a double penalty, Out-lawry and Excommunication, Confiscation of Estate, and cutting off from the Congregation. 3. It was Decreed by the Princes and Elders, jointly and unanimously in Council. 4. It



was to be published throughout *Judah* and *Jerusalem*, which could not be by those which made it, but by others. The justice and validity of the Chancellors Decree doth not depend upon the subsequent knowledge of the Parish-Minister. Yet is the Parish-Minister to act by judgment and discretion. And he may have satisfactory knowledge of the justice of the Decree, or no knowledge to the contrary before he publish it, and yet have no hand in making the Decree. The Apostles, Elders and Brethren, made a Church-Decree at *Jerusalem*, *Act. 15.* and sent it to the Churches of the Gentiles. It must needs be published by other persons than they which made it. The Judges try and Sentence a Man to be hanged for Treason. The King signs the Warrant for Execution, relying upon the justice and integrity of his Judges, and the report which he hears of the matter. If there be any scruple in the Case, he makes enquiry, and satisfies himself.

*Obj.* Christ saith, *Tell the Church*, *Mat. 18.* he doth not say, tell the Bishops Court.

*Answ.* Nor doth he say, do not tell the Bishops Court. But he saith, Submit your selves to every Ordinance of Man for the Lords sake, and be ye wise as the Serpent and innocent as the Dove. He himself appeared before the Jewish Council, and when the High Priest adjured him to declare whether he were the Christ the Son of God, he presently answered Yea. He did not decline the Jurisdiction of the Court. Nor doth he blame the Constitution both of Councils and Synagogues, *Mat. 10. 17.* but only their abuse and misgovernment. If the Bishops Court consist of  
godly

godly persons, and do orderly administer Church Justice, and things be done with an even hand, and it be Authorized by the Laws of Church and State, and in nothing repugnant to Gods word, the words of Christ do not hinder, but that you may tell the Bishops Court, and in so doing, tell the Church. For the Church is *Cætus fidelium*, the Society of the faithful Rulers and People. The Society of the faithful in *England* agree upon an Order or way for the Decision of Church-Causes, the accusing, trying, convicting, and sentencing of Hereticks and scandalous Offenders, this way, is not repugnant to Gods word, it doth not subvert the rights of the Diocesan Bishop, nor of the Parish-Ministry and Congregations. If men be upright and peaceable, this order and way is not any thing repugnant to the meekness, simplicity, and verity that is in Christ.

*Obj.* But if the Constitution of the Bishops Court be not evil, their gubernation and doing of things is. 1. They Administer Church-Censures in a Worldly profane manner. 2. They Excommunicate for trifles.

*Answ.* It cannot be expected that the hearing of Discipline Causes, and preparing them for sentence, should be done with that solemnity, reverence and devotion, that the word and Sacraments are upon a Lords Day. For there are many things come in debate and discussion, which will need interlocution, and agitation to and fro, for the ripening of them for sentence, and preparing them for Decree and Juridical publication. Church-Justice is Justice, and Justice must have its way and course, which may not be with such  
G 2. Solemnity

Solemnity and Devotion as the word and Sacraments are, and yet it may be grave and serious, fuitable to the order of Justice. But when it comes to the turn of the Parish-Minister in the face of the Congregation, to publish the Excommunication, it is done with Solemnity being done in time of Divine-Service, by an Authorized Minister.

*Obj.* The Minister is but a Cryer.

*Answ.* His Office is to be the Lords Cryer, *Isa.* 58. 1. *Cry aloud, spare not, lift up thy voice like a Trumpet, &c.* Mar. 1. 3. *The voice of one crying in the Wilderness.*

*Obj.* But a Cryer and a Judge differ.

*Answ.* Mr. Cotton in his *Keys of the Kingdom*, &c. pag. 21. saith, It is an Act of the Key of Authority, that the Elders open the Doors of speech and silence in the Assembly, *Act.* 13. 15. They rule the Congregation. If the Parish-Minister should set up a Cryer besides himself to cry the Lords word and censures, it would be against Order and Office. He is not to the Bishops Court what the Cryer at an Assizes or Sessions is to the Judge, Justices, and Jury. But he is a Minister of Christ. The Offices of the Bishop, Chancellor, and Parish-Minister are concurrent, each one hath his proper part. They do not put down one another. If there were no Chancellor, the Bishop and Parish Ministers must do the Chancellors part too. The Speaker in the Parliament-House is not a bare Cryer, but a Member of the House, and President or Moderator of the Assembly. The Judge ~~speak~~ the Bench doth not make the Verdict, the Verdict is from the Jury as Judges of the fact, and

and yet the Bench-Judge hath his part too, he acteth as Judge when he pronounceth Sentence, he doth not act as a bare Cryer to the Jury, but as a Judge. So when the Parish-Minister publisheth an Excommunication Decreed by the Chancellor, he doth not act as a bare Cryer, but as an Officer of Christ, and as a Minister in his Church, whose Office is not invaded or made null by the Chancellors, nor is the Chancellors Office made null by the Pastors Office. As to that other for Excommunicating for trifles, there is a saying, *In moralibus plus valet circumstantia quam forma.* And Divines when they treat of the difference between a mortal and a venial sin, or that which in other terms we call a reigning sin, and a sin of infirmity, do say it is difficult to state the bounds between them, and assign the just difference. For that which in many respects is a small sin, in some one respect may be so circumstantiated and aggravated as to be a great sin. The Church being a peculiar Society, the Company of the faithful, it must needs have a power within it self of conserving it self in health and soundness, and consequently of dealing in a way of regular Justice with such offending Brethren as do scandalize the Congregation, and endanger the health and peace of the Church.

Its utmost and last remedy is Excommunication, which ought not to be done, while other ways will suffice. A member is not to be cut off from the Body without apparent danger to the whole. If it may be of use to the body, if it may better be tolerated than cut off, it is not to be cut off. All therefore that I can say is, that dis-

cretion and piety must be used by those who Excommunicate. They must consider not what is the Disease, but what is the Remedy ; not what the party deserves, but what is good for the Church, and best and safest for all sides, and hath fewest inconveniencies. Authority is not to be contemned, but if every breach of humane Laws and Orders must be proceeded against by Excommunication, for ought I know we must Excommunicate all. Casuists say , that in many things humane Laws oblige *ad pœnam non ad culpam*, to the penalty not to the fault. And where is no fault, there is no ground for Church-Censure. And to aggravate small faults, and make a snare of Laws and Canons, and raise matter of Excommunication where is none, for filthy lucre, is a transgression on their part who do so; and it is a transgression on their part who do causlessly irritate Authority, and give them occasion. Rulers and ruled must bear with one another.

We see the same course used in Civil Courts, in the Process of Out-lawries and Writs of Rebellion. It is a course very hardly remediable, and perhaps when you have tryed all other ways, you will hardly find a better. If Justice have no guard upon it, it will be trampled on, good order will be laid wast. If the penal part of Justice be but as a wooden Dagger, or scarecrow, how can order be maintained? If an Ordinance of God, and cutting off from the Church be made a shadow, it is time for God to appear, and vindicate his own Glory. Over-severity to a few is better than no restraint at all, but meer Anarchy and Confusion. What marvel if by frail and sinful



ful men Church-penalties and Censures as all other Ordinances of God be perverted and abused? But this is the fault of the Man, not of his Office.

*Obj.* What difference do you make between the Bishop and the Arch-Deacon?

*Ans.* What difference do you make between my Lord Chancellor, and the Masters in Chancery his Assistants? or what difference do you make between the Colonel and Lieutenant-Colonel? The Arch-Deacon is called *oculus Episcopi: Diaconus circumlustrator & perscrutator. Vicarius post Episcopum ad quem in omnibus in Clero omnis cura pertinet.* His Office is *Dignitas principalis post Episcopum in Ecclesiâ.* The valuation of the profits of his Office is set down in the Kings Books, and he is charged with full payments of tenths and subsidies, if I do not mistake the Order of our Law. I read in the Book of Martyrs that *John Philpot*, the famous English Martyr, was Arch-Deacon of *Winchester*. I hope none will say that so famous a Man was one of the Hellish Crew. If to every Diocess of *England* there be a godly Bishop, such as *Mr. Hooper* the Martyr, and a godly Arch-Deacon, such as *Mr. Philpot*, I believe there will be work for them both, and they will both well agree, and the Church will be well Governed, and all the Parish-Ministers will have no cause to envy their Office and Dignity in the Church, but rather they will have cause to bless God for such Governours and Superintendents, and that we live in a Kingdom where the Prince and State as nursing Fathers take such care for the Church.

Every Diocess is divided into Deanries. To

every Deanry there is as I suppose a Dean, called the Rural Dean, or *Chorepiscopus*. Every such Deanry might well be made a Presbytery, or Consociation of all the Parish-Ministers within that Circuit or Deanry, and manage Church-Affairs in Concord, the Dean or *Chorepiscopus* might be President or Moderator thereof.

*Obj.* This is according to Bishop *Usher's* Model, but the Bishops at the coming in of the King would not yield to it.

*Answ.* The Objection grants that Bishop *Usher* and such as he, would yield to it. It is well known that Arch-Bishop *Grindal*, in his time, was a great promoter of a sort of exercise in those days called Prophecyings. There is an excellent Letter of his to Queen *Elizabeth* in favour thereof, in Mr. *Fullers Church History*. But it should seem as if those Exercises were attended and done with some inconveniences, and imprudencies committed by those which acted therein, which gave occasion to some to inform the Queen against them, and they were put down, and could never be got up since as I understand. But this there is, in some Dioceses of *England* stated Lectures in Market Towns frequently on the Week-Day, kept up by Neighbour Ministers, whither all may resort that will, and the Ministers of that Quarter or Deanry may lovingly meet, Consociate and Consult together as Brethren. Let but the Rural-Dean be a wise and good man, and all the Ministers within the Deanry be so also, and they will make good shift for themselves and the Churches. In a word, it is the goodness or badness of men in Office that is all in all. The great mischief of pluralities

Pluralities is when many Church Livings are bestowed upon one man, who scarce deserves one, and doth not do his duty to one place or people faithfully, and doth not provide faithful men to supply the places of his non-residence, or doth not leave a sufficient maintenance for those that reside. Let but Gods work be faithfully done, and the resident labouring Ministers have a due and sufficient maintenance, and what great matter if one man have some more maintenance than another by the Magistrates dispose, sobeit he be a worthy man, and faithfully use his talent? One single Living may exceed in value many pluralities. There is an encouragement and respect to be given to Learning, and Universities, and University-Education, and the Orders of Graduates in the University. It is an honour to be of the lowest degree or standing in the University, how much more to be of the highest. If Learning die, the Ministry will die, and so the Church will die. And if Learning have not some support and encouragement by Purse as well as praise, it will hardly subsist. *Honor transit cum onere.* And

*Haud facile emergunt quorum virtutibus obstat  
Res angusta domi.*

But that which is well framed and intended for the encouragement and support of Learning and Learned men in order to the Ministry, and of eminent Doctors and Dignitaries in the Church, may be abused, and prove a snare, and turn to the great damage of the Church and mens Souls. Happy is that remedy which provides against all mischiefs, and pares off all the evil, and secures all the good.

*Obj.*

*Obj.* A great evil in the Church of *England* is, that the people may not chuse their Pastors. In the ancient times of the Church Bishops and Presbyters were chosen by the people, and ordained in the face of the Congregation, all the people looking on and consenting.

*Answ.* It is no evil, I hope, that we have a Christian Magistracy and Universities, and those helps which the ancient Churches would have been glad of, but could not have. We are a Christian Common-wealth, the Laws of the Common-wealth are Enacted by common consent in Parliament, or they are ancient Customs approved by Parliament. If Bishops and Pastors be chosen and ordained according to Law, the people in one sense are Consenters thereto. Indeed if the Law or Custom be simply evil and contrary to Gods word, it binds none. But if it be good and allowable, no man may find fault. The great evil is when unworthy men are chosen and ordained, and those are put into Office who are unfit. It is best where both God and men are pleased. But if God be pleased, it is less matter if men be displeased. Wise and good Parents will rather displease their Children to their profit, than humour them to their hurt. The Temple and Tyths are the Magistrates. If he shall place worthy men in Office all the Land over, he doth a worthy work, the people have cause to bless God that they live under such a Government. Set times are appointed for Ordination. No man is to be ordained who is known to be unsound in the Faith, of scandalous Life, not competently Learned. All that will may resort to the Ordinations,

nations, and if they have just exceptions, they may be heard. Such as are to be Ordained, are to have due Testimonials of their sober Life. Ordinarily no man is to be Ordained *sine titulo*, and *per saltum*, that is, both Deacon and Priest at once, without just reason and necessity. It was *Bishop Halls* Custom as I remember, before the Day of Ordination, to give notice to the Congregation a Sabbath Day or more before; and to fasten a note upon the Church-Door. If the Patron be an honest man, and deny himself, he will be a Patron indeed, and take more care of the Church than of his own Life and Goods. If the Minister inducted and set in the Parish, be a worthy man, it is the peoples duty to be glad of him and thankful for him. They sin if they do not, and it is no liberty but slavery to sin. If the Minister set over them be a *Hophni*, a bad man, his badness is his own. It is the peoples Calamity. If he be intolerably bad, he is to be complained of and by course of justice removed. If he be tolerable, the people must bear with him, and make use of the best helps they can, and both be peaceable and holy, they must look well to their Souls and secure them, and they must as much as in them lies, live peaceably with all men, and pray the Lord of the Harvest, that he will send forth worthy Labourers from time to time into his Harvest.



*A word more ad hominem touching that opinion, that particular Churches are parts of the Universal, as a Troop is of an Army, or a City of a Kingdom.*

**T**HIS is Mr *Baxters* opinion. Why then do you blame the turning of all the Parish Churches into Chappelries, and making them to be but parts and members of the Church as Diocesan, as a Troop is of an Army, or a City is of a Kingdom? Suppose *England* were all the Christian World, and there were no Christians and Saints but in *England*, and all in *England* were Christians and Saints. According to your Doctrine all the Parish Churches are put down. They are not so many Churches, but parts and members of this one Church, the Church of *England*; which is to destroy your own Cause. Your great Argument against Bishops and Prelacy, and Churches Diocesan, Provyincial, and National, is, that hereby the Church-Form of Christs Institution is altered, and a new *species* of Churches is invented, by which the Parish Churches

Churches are Unchurched, and the Parish-Bishops as heads thereof are robbed of one Essential of their Office, the governing power of the Keys. Who sees not that your Doctrine doth the same which you condemn in them? For you say, that by Christs Institution Parish-Churches, or Churches particular, are parts and members of another Church, which is the Church Universal? If they are but parts and members of another Church, then they are not Churches, they are by your own Doctrine put down, and the Parish-Bishops are deprived of one essential of their Office; and this which you call the Universal Church, is made the governing Mistress of all the Churches in the World. You have written largely against Bishops and Prelacy, and Churches Diocesan, Provincial and National, and against Primates and Metropolitans, and setting Bishops over Bishops, and one Church as Governess over many. This is your great Charge against the English Prelacy, and upon this bottom stand all your Arguments in your Book of Disputations of Church-Government, and in all your other Writings, you still harp upon the same string; you call it a heinous corrupting crime to put down the Parish-Churches and Bishops, and turn them into parts of another Church; and all this while you confound your self, and maintain the very same thing which you condemn, yea in the Pope himself, by this one assertion, that particular Churches are parts and members of another Church, called the Church Universal. I confess you have a far reaching Wit, and large Understanding, and it is not unlikely but you can find somewhat to say in defence of

of this your Self-contradicting Doctrine. But I believe it will match your Wit were it ten times more, and prove too hard for you. Look to it. If your Disputations against Prelacy stand, down goes this main assertion of yours. If your Disputations against Prelacy be found to have a hollow and false bottom in them, then you have made you work for repentance, you have greatly injured the Church of God, and particularly the Church of *England*, and have deceived a great many. I am sure Mr *T. Hooker* calls this a *Popish Tenent in a Protestant Dress*; in his reasons against Mr. *Hudson*, *Survey Part 1. c. 15. pag. 253.* So that in this I am sure I am not singular. If you please to read him, there you will find the ablest of our Protestant Writers condemning this Doctrine as Popish. *Bellarmino's* definition of the Catholick visible Church is *one visible Church, or Congregation of men bound together by the profession of the same Faith, and participation of the same Sacraments, under the Government of lawful Pastors, and especially of that only Vicar of Christ on Earth, the Pontiff or Bishop of Rome.* Now look what *Bellarmino* makes the Pope to be to all the Pastors, Churches, and Christians through the World, that do you make this which you call the Church Universal. For you say, that particular Churches as headed by their respective Pastors and Bishops, are parts and members of another Church called the Church Universal. By which assertion you set up an Universal Head or Governour over all the Pastors, Churches, and Christians in the World besides Christ, and you say this is of divine Institution, and you lay the Concord of all the Churches

Churches upon it. Do but grant the Papists this one assertion, that particular Churches as headed by their respective Pastors are parts and members of the Universal Church, as a City is of a Kingdom, and overthrow the Popes Headship over all if you can. It will follow, that there must be besides Christ, an Universal Ecclesiastical Monarch upon Earth either personal or collective, who must have the supream power of Governing all the Churches in the World, unto whom all Christians, Pastors, and Churches, must be subject as Vice-Roy or Vicar General under Christ; as all the subjects in the Kingdom be subject to the King; and as all the Towns and Cities in the Kingdom be under the Regiment and authority of the King and Parliament. If there must be such an Universal Governing Head upon Earth under Christ over all Christians and Churches, you your self will grant the Pope or Bishop of *Rome* to have as good right as any other Bishop upon Earth, to be this supream governing Head. For he and his Predecessors have long pretended to it, and Papists have been and yet are a great part of Christendom, and there is none that is able to shew a better right than the Bishop of *Rome*, supposing him in all other things regular. And thus you see how much you have said for the Popes Cause, and what advantage you give the Papists by this one assertion, that particular Churches are parts and members of another Church, called the Church Universal. This one principle runs through your Books, it bears up your mainest Arguments against the English Frame of Episcopacy, you charge the same very heavily.

heavily. You see the blow lights upon your own head, and there is no way to avoid it, but either to call in your many other assertions and reasonings dispersed through your Books against you know whom and what; or else to call in this single assertion, and not think to overthrow Bishops, Presbyteries, Convocations, Arch-Bishops, and Diocesan, Provincial, and National Prelacy; by introducing Papacy and Papal Monarchy, and trespassing against the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy, and subjecting all the Churches in the World to the Bishop of *Rome*.

But indeed you have gone beyond *Bellarmino*, in setting up Papal Monarchy. Your other assertion sets up Atheism, by making the holy God the Author and Founder of two essentially different Churches or Church-Forms. According to *Bellarmino's* assertion for the Pope, there would be Pastors, and Churches, and Christians, with some dependence upon the Bishop of *Rome*, as supreme Bishop on Earth under Christ. But according to your assertion all the World must be Atheists, of no Religion at all. For grant two essentially differing Churches, and it leads to two essentially differing Religions, and two contrary Gods, which is to make no true God.

Mr. *Baxter* hath devised and framed two Covenants, the one to make a man a member of the Church Universal; the other to make a man a member of the Church particular. This is his way. According to this he would have all the Churches modell'd. Look as no man can be a member of the Church Universal without submitting to the former Covenant, so no man can be a member of



of the Church particular, that shall not submit to the latter Covenant, according to his Doctrine. He tells you what this latter Covenant is, *A Covenant or consent to be a member of the particular Church, to hold Communion therewith, and submit to the Pastor. And if any man shall intrude into their Communion and Priviledges, without expressing his consent beforehand to be a member thereof, and to submit to the Pastor, and hold Communion with that particular Church, he is to be taken for an Invader.* Thus you have Mr. Baxters way.

I will do these two things. 1. Shew that this is the very same with the upstart way of the Independents. 2. I will shew the unsoundness of it.

1. That this Doctrine is the same with that of the Independents, I will prove to you by these following Citations out of the most principal men of that way. Mr. Bartlet in his model, pag. 30, 31, 32, 33. makes visible Saints the matter of a Church, and knitting themselves into one Body or Congregation by voluntary consent to be the Form; without which they are but a casual, loose Company, under great disorder and confusion, as a heap of stones thrown together, without any further distinction. Mr. Cotton (as cited by Mr. Hudson in his Vindication) in his Catechism tells us, that a visible Church is a mystical Body, whereof Christ is the Head, the Members Saints, called out of the World, and united into one Congregation, by an holy Covenant, &c. See him most fully in his way of the Churches in New England, pag. 2. and pag. 59. too large to be transcribed. Mr. Norton (as cited also by Mr. Hud-

son in his foresaid Vindication) defines a visible Church to be a similar part of the Catholick Church, consisting of a competent number, knit together by way of visible Covenant, &c. in his Treatise of the Doctrine of Godliness. Mr. Davenport and Mr. Hooke in their *New England Catechism*, pag. 27, 29, 30. say, that a Believer is not a member of the visible Church till he have by personal and publick profession approved himself to the Church, and be by them orderly accepted into the fellowship of the Church-Covenant, in an instituted Church. Mr. Bartlet in his *Model*, pag. 32. in the margin, sets down some words of Mr. Owen (whether the now Dr. Owen or no I know not) in his *Countray Say*, pag. 60. as concurring for this way of voluntary Combination. To the same purpose, Dr. Homes in his *mischief of mixt Communions*, pag. 22. And a Book Entituled, *A brief instruction in the worship of God*, Printed 1667. quest. 19. p. 77. quest. 51. pag. 193. And the unanimous judgment of the chief heads of the Congregational Churches in their *Confession of faith*, pag. 23. where they treat of the institution of Churches, and the order appointed in them by Christ. But above all Mr. T. Hooker in the name of himself and the main Body of the *New England Ministers*, in his *Survey*, whose words will most clearly and fully open the nature and meaning of this particular Church Covenant. In the Preface are these words, Visible Saints are the only true matter of a visible Church, and Confederation is the Form. In the Book it self, Part 1. p. 46. The Conclusion we maintain is this, Mutual Covenanting and Confederating of  
the

the Saints in the Fellowship of the Faith, according to the Order of the Gospel, is that which gives Constitution and being to a visible Church. *Pag. 72.* Without this there neither is, nor ever was, or will be Pastor and Flock. *P. 50.* This is that Cement which soderes all the Church-members, that Soul as it were that acts all the parts and particular persons interested in such a way. *Pag. 70.* It is an Ordinance of the Gospel, and warranted by the Gospel, but it is not in propriety of speech the Covenant of the Gospel. *Pag. 43.* Take all the faithful, whether they be seemingly or sincerely such, scattered up and down the face of the whole Earth; these are but like scattered stones in the street, as yet there is neither Wall made up, nor frame erected. *Pag. 72.* We do not make the swearing to do a duty to be our Covenant, for that is as far different from our question almost as Heaven is from Earth. *Pag. 72, 73.* He likens it to the marriage-Covenant between man and woman, which is the foundation of Marriage-Society, and to the Contract between Master and Servant. *Pag. 54.* He argues by Induction, The Inventory of all other respects being brought in, none can constitute a Church visible but this only. Not Christian affection, nor cohabitation, nor meeting in one Assembly. Not being baptized, *pag. 55.* nor sincere profession, *pag. 61.* From this main Pillar Principle as he calls it, the nature and truth of Church-Covenant, he argues against the Baptism of the Infants of Non-Confederates: he confesses many of them to be godly, but because they refuse to Confederate in their Church way, they have no right to Baptism for their In-

fants, *Part 3. p. 11, 12.* That Pastor and People, Shepherd and flock are relates, no man that hath sipped on Logick, hath a forehead to gainsay. They are *simul naturâ*, and the one cannot be before the other; there cannot be a Pastor before there be a people which chuse him. *Episcopalis ordinatio sine titulo, est aque ridicula* (says *Ames Med. Th. l. 1. c. 39. p. 35.*) *ac si quis maritus fingetur esse absq; uxore.* And indeed it is a ridiculous thing to conceit the contrary. And hence again it follows, that Ordination which comes after, is not for the Constitution of the Officer, but the approbation of him so constituted in his Office. For *relata* are *unum uni*, says the rule, and completely give mutual causes each to the other, *Survey, Part 2. p. 68.* Though a man be duly qualified with learning and grace for the Office of a Minister, though he be ordained by the Classis, and be lawfully presented by the Patron, and inducted, and execute his office in the Parish where he is sent; all this doth not make him a true and lawful Minister of Christ, without the Election of the people, Mr *Bartlet in his model, pag. 110, 111.* Now compare this and Mr. *Baxters* Doctrine, and discern how they agree. He requires two Church-Covenants, one to make a man a member of the Church Universal, another to make the same man a member of the Church particular. He that refuses to make this latter, is not nor can be a member of the Church particular. The same say the Independents. They both agree in this also, that it must be mutual as between Husband and Wife. The Pastor must Covenant and consent on his part to every one that

that will be a member of the particular Church, to be a Pastor to them, and do his duty. Every adult member must Covenant also to the Pastor, to submit to him, and be ruled by him in things pertaining to his Office, and to be a member of that Church, and hold Communion therewith, and the members must Confederate one with another: and without this mutual Covenanting and signified antecedent consent on either part, there can be no Pastor nor Flock. I shall next shew the unsoundness of this Doctrine, in the opinion of Mr. *Rutherford*, as cited by Mr. *T. Hooker*, it is damnable will-worship, *Survey, Part 1. p. 71.*

1. Let this be considered, that a foul dash, hath been given to this way of Church-Covenanting, by Mr. *Baxter* and the Independents who are now. For when Mr. *Thomas Hooker*, and Mr. *Cotton* wrote, they with other Ministers in *New England*, laid such stress upon the particular Church-Covenant, that they refused to baptize the Infants of such as would not Confederate with them in their Church-way. This unwarrantable rigour is now laid by. The *New England* Ministers have seen a necessity of receding from the principle of their Predecessors, and it goes for current now with all, that Baptism enters us into the Church Universal. But say I, grant the principle, and Mr. *T. Hooker's* inference therefrom is unavoidable. Mr. *Hooker* did act rationally and consistently to his principle. It is Mr. *Baxter* and the Independents now who act contrary to their own principle in baptizing the Infants of Non-Confederates. How can you ju-



stife it from your own principle? The Universal and particular Church make but one holy Church of God. He that refuseth one essential of Church-Communion, is no Christian; and is therefore to be debarred from the priviledges of a Christian. But now according to your principle Non-Confederates refuse one essential of Church-Communion, therefore they may not be admitted to Baptism. If *Baal* be God, serve him. If God be God, serve him. If the principle be good, why do you not practise it? why do you baptize those who refuse to come up to all Essentials of Church-Communion? If it be bad, why do you not cast it away? why do you at all stand upon it, and say, there can be no Pastors, Churches, or Church-members without it? may those who are no Pastors baptize? surely no. Why by the Independent Doctrine the Pastor is a Pastor to no Non-confederate. I may not baptize you. You are to me a Pagan, because you refuse one essential of Church-Fellowship, and bind up my hands that I may not baptize you. There is then a contradiction between the Doctrine and practice of the Independents.

2. You say he that will be a member of a particular Church, must Covenant with the Church and Pastor. This is like the Papists who talk much of the Church, the Church cannot err: when we drive them by dint of dispute to say whom they mean by the word Church, they are constrained to yield one man the Pope. So ask Mr. *Baxter*, whom do you mean by the word Church, and at the last he must come to one man the Pastor. For till there pass a mutual Covenant be-

tween

tween the Pastor and some of the people, there is no Church. Now he that Covenanteth first can Covenant with none but the Pastor. And though many should Covenant together, they cannot Covenant with any but the Pastor. There is no Church to Covenant with. They do but Covenant to be a Church. The Church is not but by the Covenant. *Altus nullus versari potest circa id quod non est.* Those that come after may indeed Covenant with the Church, but those that Covenant first do lay the foundation, they do by Covenanting become a Church. So that you are driven to alter the terms of your Covenant, you keep to no Standard. *Primum in unoquoq; genere est mensura ceterorum.* They that Covenant first are to be the Standard to all that come after: but you vary the Standard, appointing one Covenant for them that Covenant first, and another for them that come after. The first Covenant to be a Church, the other Covenant with a Church. Besides, what Church must he Covenant with, who was first baptized?

3. You set up a Covenant in Gods Church to the disparagement of Christ the Lord and Head of the Church, in that you name the Church, and name the Pastor, but Christ is not named, he is but included. Your Covenant is a Covenant of Godliness, it comprehendeth the whole duty of a Christian, for what else is a Covenant to be a member of the Church, whether Universal or particular, but a Covenant to be a godly man? It was thought not mannerly in Cardinal Woolsey to say, *Ego & Rex meus*, I and my Master the King. You name not Christ in your Church-

Covenant, you say we must Covenant with the Pastor, and Covenant with the Church, and to be members of the particular Church of K. that is to be Saints, and Disciples of K.: but the Lord Jesus is not named.

4. You say, without this particular Church-Covenant all the faithful throughout the World are but as hewed stones, and timber, and uncompact materials, not made into a building, which is to say, that all the faithful throughout the World are Pagans. For Pagans are stones, and timber, and bare materials. They want nothing but coupling and soder. They are not glued to Christ the Foundation, nor to his body the Church, but all the faithful are as lively stones in Gods building, 1 *Pet.* 2. 5. without and before the Independent Church-Covenant.

5. This Independent Doctrine saith, that to say a Pastor at large, or a Pastor without a Flock, is as ridiculous as to say a Husband without a Wife. So that by this Doctrine the most excellent Pastors and Ministers in the Church are made meer Lay-men, as the Apostles of Christ, and Evangelists, and such as go up and down the World Preaching the Gospel to Pagans, and where Christ is not known. All such are made no lawful Ministers of Christ, and Pastors in his Church, which is plainly to subvert the Gospel. For the Apostles are the foundation of the Christian Church, *Eph.* 2. 20. And if we deny their Office and calling, we subvert the Church. They were Apostles and Pastors at large, confined to no one place, but having general office and jurisdiction. Saith Pharaoh to Josephs brethren, what is your

*our occupation? And they said, we are Shepherds,*  
*Gen. 47. 3.* May not a man be a Shepherd by calling and occupation, unless he have a Flock? why not, as well as a man may be a Physician by calling, though he have no Hospital to oversee and take special care of?

6. According to this Doctrine a Minister hath no Office or Authority save just to those of his own Charge. So often as he hath call to preach any where else, he preacheth but as a gifted man. He hath no Office to any that are not Confederate to him, no more than the Constable hath out of his Town, or the Master out of his own Family, which is certainly an error. A Minister is by Office and calling a Minister in all places where he shall come. He carries his Office along with him, and may exercise it upon due call, and when opportunity is offered.

7. This Doctrine of a particular Church-Covenant maketh void Gods Ordinance of Ordination. For either Ministers are Ministers by Ordination, or they are not. If yea, then this Doctrine of a Church-Covenant is erroneous. If no, then Ordination is of no use. If Church-Covenanting, that is, a mutual Bond between a gifted man and the people, make Pastor and people, then Ordination, which is an holy Ordinance of God is made void, there is no place for it. If Ordination give the Office, then Church-Covenanting doth not, and consequently the Independent Doctrine is not sound. All agree that Ordination is the act not of the people, but of ordaining Ministers.

*Obj.* Ordination doth not give the Office,  
 it

it is but like Crowning to the King.

*Answ.* Just Ordination gives the Office. The King is King before Coronation: but a gifted chosen man is not a Minister till Ordination, where Ordination may be had. The seven men chosen for Deacons, *Act. 6.* were not authorized Officers till ordained by the Apostles.

*Obj.* Election, saith Dr. *Ames*, gives *jus ad rem*. Ordination gives *jus in re*. Mr. *T. Hooker* in his *Survey*, Part 2. p. 40, 41.

*Answ.* Election prepares the way for Ordination, it giveth *jus ad ordinationem ceteris concurrentibus*. But it giveth not the Office. It is by Ordination that we are Constituted Officers and Ministers of Christ, and not by Election, much less by a Church-Covenant.

8. This Doctrine of a Church-Covenant inferreth, that the Church is before Officers, which is to say, that Pagans are a Church before the Apostles come to them, and convert and baptize them. Baptism cannot be done but by Officers. They must be Officers before they baptize, or else they baptize as Lay-men, and so without Warrant. How can people make Church-Officers before they be Christened? They are first Christened by Church-Officers, and then they become Church-members and Christen Folks.

9. This Doctrine putteth a new clause into Baptism which Christ never put, and so it altereth Christianity. Before I baptize you I must have an antecedent Covenant or signified consent from you to submit to me. You must not only be baptized in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; but also in the name of *Paul*,  
in



in the name of *Peter*, in the name of the Baptizer. For the Independent Doctrine is, no Church-Covenant, no Church-member, no right to any Church-Ordinance: and one clause in the Covenant required is, you must Covenant to submit to the Baptizer, or I cannot baptize you. But *Paul* rejects being baptized in his name, 1 Cor. 1. 13.

10. Moreover this Church-Covenant makes the people Church-Rulers or Copartners in Office with the Pastors, so that without their consent and free vote he can do nothing: he cannot baptize, nor give the Lords Supper, nor rule and edifie his Congregation but by the votes of the people. The reason is, because they are an Independent Body, Society, or Corporation, knit together by a mutual Covenant, the Pastor to the people, and the people to him, and to one another. And why should any of the people be bound to Confederate with such as they know not, or are unsatisfied in? Though the people are not the Pastor, yet the people have a vote. As in the Parliament, though the Lords and Commons are not the King, yet every one of them hath a vote, no Law can be passed without their free vote. So King *Solomon* had many Wives, every Wife had some more rule and office than a servant or meer stranger.

*Obj.* *Quod omnes attingit ab omnibus tractari debet.* That which concerns all is to be handled by all.

*Ans.* Then let Women, and Children, and the basest of the people be Judges, and Pastors, and Law-makers. There is no such principle in right

right Law as that forecited: but rather, that which concerneth all is to be handled and ordered most wisely and decently, and to the edification of all.

11. This Doctrine of a Church-Covenant setteth up rebaptization by a Law, saving the outward water and change of words. For it requireth of godly baptized ones an antecedent Covenant to be members of the particular Church, and to hold Communion therewith, which is equivalent to a Covenant of Godliness and Christianity. As if a man should Covenant to be a godly Citizen of *London*. This Covenant includes two things. 1. To be a godly man. 2. To be a Citizen of *London*. So a Covenant to be a member of Gods Church at *K.* and to hold Communion therewith, and to do his duty to the Pastor and People thereof, it includes whole Christianity: so that the people hereby are called upon as it were to be new Christened, as though they were not Christen people before.

12. This Covenant is not safe: For it bindeth people to what God hath not bound them, and that is to be dwellers within the Precinct of that one particular Church, to hear no other Minister, to join with no other Congregation. If you shall say it is not intended that their just liberty be abridged:

*Answ.* But who shall be judge? He that makes the Law is to expound it. Gods Law and Covenant we know and scruple not. Mens Covenants we cannot know but by the words themselves. I am not for wandering and unsetledness. But why

why people should be under a Bond and tie to their own Minister and Congregation only, God having no where bound them, I know not.

13. How can godly strangers, Sojourners, Travellers, and persons itinerant, whose employments lie abroad, and tarry but for a night and away, make this Covenant? must they make it and unmake it in the same hour? or must they be counted invaders if they enter the Congregation, and join in hearing Prayer and praise, unless beforehand they Covenant with the Church and Pastor? Your words are that they are invaders in case they intrude into the Communion and Priviledges of that Church without signifying their consent before-hand to be members thereof, and submit to the Pastor. And are not hearing the word, Prayer, and praise, considerable parts of the Communion and Priviledges of that Church as well as the Lords Supper? yea, and are not private exercises of Religion, as holy Conference, Prayer, praise, parts also of the Communion and Priviledges of that Church?

*Obj.* It is not he that transiently cometh into the Temple: But he that will make himself one of my special charge, and oblige me to all the duty which I owe to my charge, and cannot pay to all men, and he that will claim a vote in choosing the Bishop, &c. he I say is an invader if he intrude without signifying his consent beforehand, &c.

14. *Answ.* Whether the person be a constant Inhabitant, or a Stranger or Sojourner, it is all one to your Doctrine in case he refuse your Church-Covenant. Though he be baptized, sincerely

cerely godly, of an upright life, and all this be known to you; your Doctrine makes him an invader if he shall intrude into the priviledges and Communion of the particular Church, without an antecedent Covenant or signified obliging consent before-hand, to be a member of the particular Church, &c. I will transcribe a passage out of Dr *Homes* in his *mischief of mixt Communion*, pag. 22. "Parochial Churches in the matter for the generality consist of profane and ignorant; and their Form and Union is only by the Gutters, and Stones, and Posts of the Precincts of the Parish, making them to belong to that Congregation of that Parish. But when they move House but over the Gutter into another Parish, they are no more of that Parish Church. Here is no spiritual Bond, relation, or mutual owning, or reciprocal watching between Minister and people, or between people and people. So he. We do not say that meer dwelling in the Parish makes us Christians. But we say meer dwelling in the Parish doth not make us Pagans. We may be godly Christians and yet dwell in the Parish. According to your Doctrine, though the Minister be a godly man, and faithfully do his duty by publick and private oversight, though the people of the Parish be baptized godly persons, and love and honour their Minister, and resort to his Ministry, and be united by Faith and Love to Jesus Christ, and to all his Saints and faithful Ministers, the Minister all this while is no Minister, the people all this while are no Christians, there is no spiritual bond, relation, or mutual ownings, or reciprocal watching between Minister

(III)

ster and people, or between people and people of that Parish, for want of a particular, antecedent, mutual Covenant and Confederation; without this you count them loose stones and uncompact materials, and so meer Pagans. They are no more lawful Pastor and people, according to your Doctrine, than Whore-monger and Whore going together, and committing acts of filthiness, and living in Fornication all their days, are lawful Husband and Wife, for want of a lawful and regular Contract and Marriage-Covenant to be the foundation of Marriage-Society.

What do you speak of *litteræ Communicatoria*, from one Church to another? These are nothing to your Case. For were it St. Paul himself, the most holy man living, and so known to all the Congregation, the Independent Doctrine shuts him out of all particular Churches and Congregations under Heaven, except he shall by an antecedent Covenant or voluntary consent, some way signified, oblige himself before-hand to be a member of the particular Church, to submit to the Pastor, and to hold Communion therewith. As in Popery no man is counted a Christian, that doth not also own and subject himself to the Pope: so with the Independents no man is counted a member of any particular Congregation, nor can be, till he stand bound by a Covenant or particular engagement before-hand so to be, and to submit to the Pastor, and hold Communion with the particular Church. "This (saith Mr. Bartlet in his model, pag. 74.) is the revealed will of Christ, that the Administration of the Seals is limited to Pastors and Teachers, and they to their own particular



"particular charge; and then if they had all the  
 "humility in the World, that is in the hearts of  
 "the Saints, yet that would not allow them to  
 "go against the least part of the revealed will  
 "and mind of Christ; which they should do, if  
 "they should administer Church-Ordinances to  
 "such as are of no Church, and refuse also to sit  
 "down in Fellowship with them. That is, who  
 refuse to make this their particular Church-Cove-  
 nant which they make to be as the Soul to the  
 Body, the very Essence and Form of a particular  
 Church, without which there can be no Pastor,  
 no people, no Church. Why else did the *New-  
 England* Brethren shut out the Infants of Non-  
 Confederates?

15. This Doctrine without just reason layeth  
 waste Parish bounds, leaving people to go to what  
 Church they will, and join themselves to what  
 Pastor and people they please, though the Pa-  
 rish-Minister should be a worthy man, and faith-  
 fully do his duty. The Independents in their  
 Confession of Faith say, that a godly man dwel-  
 ling in the Parish may join himself with any  
 Church for his edification, intimating that being  
 a godly man and a Parishioner, doth not make  
 him a member of the Parish Church, there is one  
 essential wanting, *pag. 26. f. 23.* Now this is to  
 teach people to be disorderly. No man without  
 cause is to go from his own Parish Church or  
 Chappelry. *Numb. 2. 2. Every man of the Chil-  
 dren of Israel shall pitch by his own standard, with  
 the ensign of their fathers house.* And we may pro-  
 bably gather that it was our Saviours practice  
 where ever he came to resort to the proper Syna-  
 gogue

gogue of the place where his present abode was, *Luk.* 4. 16. *Joh.* 18. 20. If the Parish-Pastor be a worthy man, and faithfully do his duty, and there be room for all in the Parish to come, what just ground can any have ordinarily to go to another Church, much less to a Church further off, and it may be not to so good means? I am against binding people by a Covenant to attend the Ministry of this or that particular Pastor; and I am against peoples unreasonable going from their own Church, neither to their own nor others edification.

16. According to the Independent Doctrine, if the Pastor set over them be an *Hophni*, a Son of *Belial*, and sinfully tolerated by the Magistrate, the people of the Parish, who can neither remove him, nor sit under a more edifying Ministry, must Covenant themselves to him as their Pastor, except they will sinfully separate from Gods Ordinances and Church-Communion.

17. Moreover, for how long must this Covenant last? our Covenant with God must be perpetual, Husband and Wife Covenant for life, Master and Servant set down the time: but you do not set down in your Church-Covenant for how long this Confederation must last. And is not that a material thing? If you name no time, it is left uncertain. If you pitch upon a time, probably it cannot be kept, because the times may alter, and many things may fall out, which may necessitate the Pastor to flee or go to a new place, or the people to remove their dwelling. What time shall be set for Sojourners and godly Strangers? If the Covenant must hold but ~~for a~~ *benefit*

*bene placito*, it were better not make it. If *quandiu* the Pastor and people, *se bene gesserint*, were it not good to say so?

18. If the Pastor misbehave himself or prove heretical, or scandalous or insufficient, what course shall be taken with him? The people cannot degrade him. Those only can degrade who have power to constitute. But that the people have not. Neighbour Pastors by the Independent Doctrine have no power but over their own flock. All Officers are levelled and made equal, and confined to a particular Church, and have no office or authority but just over their Confederate Flocks. Indeed the Independent Doctrine alloweth of Synods, Associations, and meetings of Pastors: but it denieth them authority over the particular Congregation. All Authority and Jurisdiction is placed in the particular Congregation, issuing from the nature and being of this Church-Covenant: this creates Pastors, this creates people, this creates right to Ordinances. So that further than this Church-Covenant extendeth there is no authority in the Church. And where this Church-Covenant is not, there is no Authority, saith *Mr. T. Hooker in his Survey Part 2. pag. 80.* "Every particular Congregation, rightly constituted and compleated, is Independent, that is, it hath sufficiency in it self to exercise all the Ordinances of Christ. And indeed if this Doctrine of Church-Covenanting stand, their assertion is unavoidable. But the assertion it self implies a contradiction. For how come the Ministers and Officers of the particular Congregation to be created Officers? not by the peoples

peoples Vote and Election, not by Church Covenanting, but by Episcopal or Presbyterian Ordination. It is Ordination which makes Ministers and Officers at large. Now Ordination is an Ordinance of God. It cannot belong to every particular Congregation without Confusion, and making the people both Pastors and people. Moreover a Council, Synod, or Consultation of the Pastors and Brethren of many remote or Neighbour Churches, is an Ordinance of God, as is plain from *Act. 15*. And the Independents confess it. They allow a just use of Synods for Consultation and Concord, though not for Authority. Now this destroys their main assertion, that a particular Congregation hath a power or sufficiency within it self to exercise all the Ordinances of Christ. A Synod of Ministers by their own Confession is an Ordinance of Christ, and such an Ordinance as a particular Congregation is not capable of. There are other duties and Ordinances which cannot be done in a particular Congregation. I will grant that every Congregation consisting of Pastor and people, is in a sound and moderate sense Independent, and hath a sufficiency of power within it self to edifie it self in love, and to preserve it self from ruine, if it do not by its own vice and failings ruine it self. We are to depend upon God rather than Man; if others will not do their duty, we must do ours. No man can perish but by his own sin and folly. And so no particular Church is without a sufficiency of Power, I say not to exercise all Christs Ordinances, but to exercise such and so many of them as be necessary to salvation, and for the preservation

servation of the Society from ruining vice and error. But whence hath it this Authority? From the particular Church-Covenant? No in no wise. The particular Church-Covenant is a thing of mans invention, no where required of God, it is destructive to the Church and Souls should it be practised. But the Authority of Pastors is by Ordination regularly. And it is by Baptism and simple godliness and cohabitation, without this particular Church-Covenant that the people come to be Church-members. But if all Church-power did stand and grow by this particular Covenant or Church-Confederation, then indeed it would unavoidably follow that all Church-Power is in a particular Congregation. But then it would prove a *Babel*, a meer self destroying way of Confusion, and would quickly root up all the Churches should it be practised. And what must Heathens and persons without the Church do, who can make no Pastors themselves? The Independent Doctrine alloweth them none.

19. I know but two things that can with any colour be pretended for this device of a Church-Covenant, as an Ordinance of God, essential to the being of Pastor and Flock, and that is the peoples right to chuse their Minister, and that a Minister cannot be a Pastor or Minister to any against their will. Now as to Election, it is quite and clean another thing from this matter of Church-Covenanting. For let it be granted, that all who are to be Ordained Ministers and Church-Officers, must first be chosen by the people, as the seven men designed for Deacons, *Act. 6.* were,



were, this will nothing help the Independent cause. For it is evident from the Text and the nature of the thing, that the seven men so chosen and pitched on were not Deacons till ordained by the Apostles. The people could not say, by our Election you are Deacons, we give you the Office, but we think you fit men for the Office, we chuse and pitch upon you, we shall present you to the Apostles to be by them Ordained. And when you are Ordained by them, we shall be bound to own you as men in Office, and submit to you. So that it is clear the peoples Election, and the Independent Church-Covenant do utterly differ. *Relata sunt simul naturâ.* They are *unum uni*: as Parent and Child, Master and Servant, Husband and Wife, King and Subject. *Posito uno relatorum ponitur alterum.* But now the Election of persons for the Ministry is another thing. Till they be Ordained they are no men in Office, where Ordination may be had. They are but persons designed, and under nomination, as materials only ready for the building, but not put together. And when a Minister is Ordained he is not thereby knit to a particular Congregation as the Husband is to his Wife, or the Servant to his Master: but he is Ordained a Minister of Christ, and is by calling and occupation a Pastor in Gods Church, having authority to exercise his Ministry to any people, in any place, at any time as he shall have just call. And as where Ordination cannot be had, the people may for the present necessity chuse them a Minister, *Ezek. 33. 2.* So where Election cannot be had, as in all Cases it cannot, Ordination without it is sufficient. Christs Apo-

stles were made Ministers by Christ without any votes or choice of the people. And they are the most excellent Ministers who in imitation of the Apostles go up and down preaching the Gospel where Christ is not known, and Profelyting Souls to God, and founding new Churches, and thereby enlarging the Kingdom of Christ. Besides, the Election of persons for the Ministry is not like voting for Parliament-men, and chusing Constables, Church-Wardens, and Town and Parish-Officers for outward matters. For in those Cases none but the Gentlemen and Freeholders of the County may vote for Parliament-men: and none but the people of the Town or Parish may vote in the choice of their Officers, and not all neither, but some few only. But now in the Election of persons for the Ministry the matter is otherwise. It is not a matter of Worldly vote, but the business is to discern and perceive if the person to be Ordained be fit for the Office. Now learning is one qualification of a Minister. And how can the people, those of them that are unlearned, as most are, judge of that? If any man whosoever shall come and put in an exception against the person to be Ordained, as that he is Heretical, scandalous, grossly ignorant, and shall make good his Allegation, he is to be heard, and the person that stands for Ordination is not to have it. For the Church is but one Society or Corporation, and no unworthy man knowingly, is either to be Elected or Ordained Minister: and he that can shew and prove it, of what Parish, County, or Nation soever he be, is to be heard. Besides, we see in many places how the people  
are

are divided, and many are ignorant, profane, worldly, haters of goodness, very indifferent whether they have Ministers or no; many are Prentices, and Servants, and Children, and inferiours under rule. If *Cain* must chuse *Abel*, and the people must be Judges whether Christ or *Barabbas*, and the major vote must carry it, I wot what will become not of the Ministry only, but of godliness it self. Shall the blind have equal vote with the seeing, and the foolish with the wise, and the refuse of the people with holy and grave experienced Christians, and with Magistrates and Pastors in the choice of persons for the Ministry? it cannot be, it is against reason, order, and the common good. Great discretion is to be used. The people are to be pleased for their good, and it may be wisdom and compassion to displease them for their good. But let the matter light how it will. This antecedent Election of persons for the Ministry is quite another thing from the Independent Church-Covenant: for they make it as another Baptism to be submitted to by every one that will be a Church-member.

20. There is then but this other thing that can be said in defence of it, and that is, that no man can be a Pastor to a people against their will. I grant their will is their own. He cannot do their duty and his own too. But he is a Pastor by Office and Calling whether the people will or no. And this is sufficient to overthrow the Independent Doctrine, which saith, that Pastor and people are *simul naturâ*, as Husband and Wife. This is false. God is God whether the people

will or no, and Christ is Christ whether the people will or no, and the Apostles were Apostles though thousands rejected and persecuted their Ministry; and so faithful Ordained Ministers are by Office and Calling Pastors and Ministers in Gods Church, though hated, scorned, despised, and refused by thousands both within and without the Church. If all the Parish were Pagans, the Minister lawfully ordained and appointed to convert and baptize and be a Pastor to them, is a true, full, and compleat Pastor, before he have Christened one Soul of them. And when he hath Converted and Christened them, they become his special charge, how? by being Baptized, by practising Godliness, by attending his Ministry, and dwelling in the Parish. Here is no particular antecedent Combination between Pastor and People, and between people and people, excepting that of Baptism, Godliness, and Christianity, common to all Christian Churches and Pastors. You require two Church-Covenants; the one to make a member of the Church Universal, the other to make the same man a member of the Church particular. This later is a meer device of man, subverting the former.

21. Mark the matter. You are a baptized person, you are a Parishioner, you are a godly Man, I have nothing against you: only this, I cannot take you for one of my Flock, nor own my self for your Pastor unless you shall by a particular Covenant or voluntary consent beforehand, oblige your self to submit to me as your Pastor, to be a member of this Church, to hold Communion therewith. If you refuse, I must shut

shut you out as an Apostate or as a Pagan.

*Obj.* Though I deny him to be a Member of the Church particular without his antecedent particular Covenant, yet I do not shut him out of the Church Universal, I allow him to be a member of the Church Universal.

*Ans.* This which you say makes against you. For as St. *Peter* saith, Can any man forbid Water, that these should not be baptized who have received the Holy Ghost as well as we? *Act.* 10. 47. So can any man forbid these people from being members of the Church particular who are members of the Church Universal as well as we? What is the best of your Covenanted Flock, or what is the Independent Pastor, but a member of the Church Universal, that is, a godly man, a faithful Christian? How can you shut out of your Church on Earth those whom you acknowledge to be Heirs and Members of the Church in Heaven? You say you do not cast them out of the Church Universal; what less do you do? you cast them out of all Parish-Churches and particular Congregations under Heaven. If they be not fit to be members of your Church where they dwell and have their abode, how are they fit for any other Church? will meer change of air and place change their Souls? Are they ungodly in your Parish, and would they be godly in the next? If you cast him out of the Church particular, you cast him out of the Church Universal. For the Church is but one. You grant him to be a member of the Church Universal, and so a godly man, having right to the Kingdom of Heaven,



Heaven, you have nothing against him but this one thing, his refusal to bind himself by a Covenant no where required by God.

*Obj.* We do not bind people to express Covenanting, or to one way of expressing and notifying their consent.

*Answ.* You plainly bind them to Covenanting and consent, and the signifying of it some way. You say the more express it is, the better it is. And the Scripture saith, that all things are to be done decently and to edification. And therefore good reason it should be done by some apt significant sign. If it be as essential to the being of a member of the particular Church, as Baptism and Christianity is to the being of a member of the Church Universal, then why should it not be as express as Baptism? And why did not Christ name it in his grand Commission to his Apostles, *Mat.* 28. 18, 19, 20? And why do none of the Apostles in all the New Testament make mention of it? And how come all the Churches to be without it, except some few framed after the Independent and *Mr. Baxters* model? And why did the Presbyterians of old oppose it, as *Mr. Hudson* in his Vindication, and *Mr. Rutherford* the great Champion for Presbytery, calling it (yea and more than calling it) will-worship and damnable as I have before cited, and says plainly it is to make a new Gospel, which who so does is accursed, *Mr. T. Hookers Survey*, Part 1. p. 78. But this objection plainly grants, that as for all such as refuse to make this Covenant, they are cut off from being members of the particular Church. And how great a part of Christen-

Christendom are those? A million to one if you reckon from the Apostles time to this day. We are not to threap Church-Covenants upon people against their will, and imagine them to Covenant when they do not.

*Obj.* There is the same Church-Covenant in all the Churches though not explicitly. We do but require that explicitly which all other Churches do implicitly.

*Answ.* There is in all the Churches not only an implicate but an explicite Church-Covenant, which is that we enter into in Baptism, when we come to years we take it upon our selves, and live in the performance of it all our days. So that there is truly in all the Churches, both an implicate and explicite Church-Covenant, the Covenant of Christianity and Godliness, common to all Christians and Churches. But as for your other particular Church-Covenant, it is not in any of the Churches, unless it be those of the Independents, neither explicite nor implicate. I have proved unto you, that the Election of Ministers is quite another thing from this your Church-Covenant. It is one thing for a Christian to do a thing willingly, and another thing to oblige himself by a particular antecedent Covenant to do it. The former is in all the Churches: the later the Independents would obtrude upon all the Churches as a Divine Ordinance, necessary to the being of Pastors, people and Churches. Your Covenant is to this effect, you shall not only submit to me as your Pastor, but you shall bind your self by a particular antecedent Covenant so to do. You shall dwell in  
the

the Parish, and Covenant so to do. You shall come to Church and Sacrament, and Covenant by a particular Covenant beforehand so to do. Must we make particular Covenants as necessary to Salvation for every duty of our lives? Cannot a man eat his meat, and go to Bed, and follow his Calling, without making so many particular Covenants as there are particular duties, as a matter of Religion, and necessary to Salvation? what endless superstition and distracting work would this be?

Why do you not also require of Husbands a solemn Church-Covenant to do their duty to their Wives; and so from Wives to their Husbands; and from Parents to their Children, and from Children to their Parents; and from Masters and Servants, Magistrates and people mutually towards each other? why must the people of *Kederminster* enter into a Covenant with the people of *Kederminster*, to discharge their duties one to another, without any mention of the people of other Churches and Parishes? do they owe no duty but to those of their own Church?

*Obj.* We do not make the swearing to do a duty to be our Covenant, for that is as far differing from our question almost, as Heaven is from Earth, *Mr. Hooker in his Survey, Part 1. pag. 72.*

*Answ.* This makes your cause worse. The best that can be pleaded for it is a Covenant to perform some duty. It is not simply unlawful in it self for a man to swear or Covenant to do his duty to his Pastor, to the Constable, to his Wife, to his Neighbours. But to say that God hath bound

bound people by absolute Command to tie themselves by a particular Covenant to do their duty to the Constable, or to their Servants, is in the judgment of Mr. *Rutherford* damnable will-worship.

*Obj.* "These things are seriously to be distinguished and differenced. 1. An Agreement of persons one to and with another to combine and consociate in the ways and worship of Christ. 2. The doing of these duties. 3. The swearing they will do them, when they are combined. The first of these is the Form of a Corporation. The other two may be done when they are incorporated. Thus 1. Man and Woman engage themselves each to other by way of contract. 2. Being contracted they do the duties. 3. They may swear and bind themselves to God, they will do them. *I have sworn and will perform it, that I will keep thy righteous judgments.* Mr. *T. Hooker* in his *Survey*, Part 1. pag. 73.

*Ans.* Your distinction mars your cause. For Gods Church is one Corporation. By Baptism and consent to Gods Covenant we become members of this Corporation, united to Jesus Christ, and to all the living members of his body. We are Christian people, and Freemen of the Heavenly Society and Corporation. Now you make two essentially different Corporations, the Church Universal, and the Church particular. Or if not that, you require one thing as essential to Church entrance and Communion no where required by God. Either way you subvert the Gospel. You are the Pastor of a Church in *New England*. I  
am

am an inhabitant within the Precinct thereof. I am baptized, I fear God, I stand to my vow in Baptism, I demand as my right from you the Ordinances of Christ.

*Obj.* You are no member of this particular Church unless you Covenant before-hand to be a member of this Church, to submit to me as Pastor, to hold Communion with this Church. Until you make this Covenant you are under no tie or engagement to me. I cannot look upon you as my charge.

*Ans.* I tell you I am a Christian, and I stand to my vow in Baptism, and I am your Neighbour, and one of your Parish known to you, and as my vow in Baptism binds me to do my duty sincerely to all men, so I am ready to perform any duty to you and the people of this place which you shall make known to me from Gods word. I am under a solemn Vow or Covenant already to do my duty to you and to all men. If you require of me another Covenant as essentially necessary to make me a member of your Church and to give me right to the Ordinances, you require of me a thing no where required by God. If you can prove me no Christian man, or that I walk disorderly, proceed against me. But if you have nothing against me but only this, that I refuse to bind my self by antecedent Covenant to submit to you as my Pastor, to be a member of your Church, and to hold Communion therewith, you commit Church-Tyranny, and teach for Doctrines the Commandments of men. I owe you no such Covenant. Will you say that I lie under no Oath or Covenant to you? what do you make  
of



of the Baptifmal Covenant, and my being a Chriftian man, and a fworn devoted fervant of God? Is this no tie upon me? doth not this effectually bind me to do whatfoever duty I owe to you or any man in the World? If I be faithful in performing this Vow, can you juftly require more of me?

*Obj.* But I am not bound to take every one that fhall come into my Parifh for one of my charge.

*Anfw.* You are bound to ferve God, and to love your Neighbour as your felf, and to fubmit to every Ordinance of man for the Lords fake. And if the Laws of Church and State, and ancient approved Custom time out of mind, have meted out Parifhes, and diftributed to every Church and Chappelry its limits and compafs, and you be placed Minifter in the Parifh-Church, you can but do the duty of one man; but all that in you lies you are bound by the reasonable Laws and Customs of the place where you are, to procure the good of all the Souls within your Parifh or Precinct; and not to make new Parifhes, and Church-bounds. Mark the Scripture, *Tir.* 1. 5. *Ordain elders in every City*, *Act.* 14. 23. *They ordained them elders in every Church.* Had they not Church-bounds then? we read of no particular Covenant, or cementing knot between Pastor and people, as the Form or Effence of a particular Church, over and befides Baptifm and fimple Chriftianity, and dwelling in the City, and the ordaining of Minifters to be with them.

The plain truth is, we ought rather to forbid the people from entering into any Covenant to us,

*Act.*

*Act. 10. 25, 26.* As *Peter* was coming in, *Cornelius* met him, and fell down at his feet, and worshipped him. But *Peter* took him up, saying, stand up; I my self also am a man. So say I as to my self and all my Fathers and Brethren in the Ministry, we are men, and not God. Covenant your selves to God. Believe not every spirit: but try the spirits. There are many false Teachers abroad in the World; beware of them. There are many Sect-Teachers, which cause Divisions and offences contrary to the Doctrine of Christ, they serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own Belly. You are bidden to mark and avoid them. We come not to make you Servants to us, but to God. He is Lord of all. He is infallible. Fear and serve God, do your duty to all men. Reverence all faithful Ministers. If you want one, get one as soon as you can, and the best you can. If you have a godly Minister, submit to him, profit by his Ministry, and be his joy. But if the Minister shall say I am no Pastor but to such as Covenant themselves to me, and I to them, and it is a mutual tie between Pastor and Flock which makes them so, and founds the relation as between Husband and Wife; and the people of one Church must Confederate one with another, leaving all other Churches and people out of their Confederacy, and reputing Non-Confederates no Church-members; such a Covenant is not to be submitted to by any man, it subverteth the Church and mens Souls. In this Case with *Paul* I am to give place by subjection, no not for an hour, that the truth of the Gospel may continue, *Gal. 2. 5.* And as he says of Circumcision, be-  
hold

hold I *Paul* say unto you, that if ye be Circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing, *Gal. 5. 2.* So say I, if ye set up a Covenant in Gods Church no where required by God, and shall lay it as a Law upon mens Consciences, and teach that without it Pastors are not Pastors, Churches are not Churches, Christian people are not Christian people, it is the true and only way of Concord of all the Christian World, comprehensive, sure, fitted by Christ himself to the interest of all good men, yea of the Church and all the World, I do utterly withstand it as wickedness and abomination in Gods Church. I am to die and burn at a stake, before I yield to any such thing. This is Mr. *Baxters* way. He offers it to Bishop *Morley* and Bishop *Gunning*, in his Preface to his last Book of Concord, that posterity may see what it was that he would have had, and laboured to have set up in all the Churches. And accordingly let both the present and future Ages see and know.

You think me a strange man for opposing your Book of Universal Concord, and now your last Book of the true and only way of Concord of all the Christian Churches, as if I were set on by the Devil, and as if I contradicted my self, and were against free consenting to the Ministry. I tell you that is not the Case. I am not against but for an explicate Church-Covenant. But I am against two Church-Covenants, whether explicate or implicate, essentially differing. You and the Independents make two Churches, two Church-Forms, and as it were two Baptisms: one Baptism for the Church Universal, another

K
Baptism

Baptism for the Church particular. This later I withstand. Nay your way is not so innocent as that of rebaptizing. For the very matter and terms of your Church-Covenant are unsafe and plainly Schismatical; as if the Constables and people of each Town must Confederate together to be a Corporation, an Independent Body of themselves, having all jurisdiction within themselves, and such as will not enter into this Confederacy must be counted none of the Kings Subjects. We will be an Independent self-sufficient Society within our selves, we will make us Officers, Judges, Lawyers, Statesmen, we will hear and try all causes, other Towns and Cities shall have no authority over us, we will have none over them, but every Town shall be furnished and compleated with Officers of its own calling and chusing, and shall have equal, entire, independent jurisdiction within it self.

To say there are no Churches in the World but a few Independent Churches, or as they are nonsensically called Congregational Churches, as if you should say Congregational Congregations, *idem ejusdem*, to say this were to go beyond Brownism, it were rather to teach Infidelity. Such an opinion would be abhorred by all. Now Mr. *Baxters* and the Independent Doctrine saith it, though they perceive it not. I charge not upon them the consequences of their error. I do not say they hold it practically. I acknowledge them holy and eminent men of God, and my self not to be named with the meanest of them. I acknowledge their Churches to be true and godly Churches, their people to be godly,  
their

their Ministry and worship godly. But all this is no Con-thanks to their error. Their error should they hold it habitually, predominantly, and practically would certainly be their damnation.

Mr. *Zechary Cawdrey* some years ago wrote a Tract for mutual explicite Covenanting between Pastor and people. But to do my worthy Friend right, his is quite another thing from the Independent way. 1. He doth but propose it as prudential. 2. He doth not urge it as an Ordinance of God. 3. He doth not say there can be no Pastor or Church without it. 4. He doth but propose it as expedient *pro hic & nunc*, not for all times. 5. Nor for any but us in *England*. 6. Nor for us neither without the leave and approbation of authority. 7. To my remembrance his way is only a Covenant to do a duty. But saith *M. T. Hooker*, that is as far differing from our Covenant almost as Heaven is from Earth. The Independent Covenant according to their Doctrine, is necessary by divine Law for all times, as well under the Law as under the Gospel; for all Churches, Pastors and people to the Worlds end, whether Magistrates command it or no, they make it as essential to the being of a Church, Christianity, and the Pastors Office, as the Marriage-Covenant is to the founding of the relation between Husband and Wife. For my part, if the King and Parliament should establish Mr. *Cawdreys* way, if it contain no more than the seven particulars aforesaid, as I think it doth not; I would submit and peaceably obey, and persuade others to do so too: though I am still of



opinion, that all thing considered, it were better to set up no such practice to be generally observed throughout all the Churches in *England*. But that such a course may not at some time, and to some places, and in some Cases be prudential, I will not say. If all the Parish-Ministers in *England* were like Mr. *Cawdrey*, the Case were otherwise. But both he and others know too many Parish-Ministers, such as I will not describe. I would have the people to do all their just duty to the worst Ministers while the Magistrate tolerates them. If there be *Hophnies* and *Phinehasses* in the Church, and the people can neither get them removed, and better put in their room, nor place themselves under a more edifying Ministry, I think they may safely sit under the Ministry of such men, and partake of Gods Ordinances at their hands, and may neither sit at home, nor unwarrantably separate from publick worship, Ordinances and Communion. If the people sigh and mourn for what they cannot get amended, and faithfully do their duty, God will bless them. But if any should advise to the making of a Law that all the faithful in *Israel* shall Covenant and engage to submit to the Ministry of such Sons of *Belial*, ungodly and scandalous Priests; I had rather they would let the people do their duty without a particular Covenant or engagement to do it, and if a Law must be made, that it be for the turning out or reforming of such scandalous Priests.

Let not Mr. *Baxter* think that I deny any of the just rights of the people in the choice of their Ministers, or that I give more to the Magistrate than

than is safe and allowable in the appointing of Ministers, or think all to be Rebels and Traytors who have not Pastors set over them by the care of the Magistrate. If any words of mine have given him occasion so to think, I am sorry for it. Mr. *Philip Nye* was an eminent Independent Minister, yet he as Mr. *Baxter* confesseth, wrote to prove, That the Christian Magistrate may set up Teachers all over his Dominions; whom the people, upon his Command, are bound to hear; But to take any for their Pastors, he thought they might not be compelled. This assertion of Mr. *Nye*, Mr. *Baxter* for ought I can perceive approves, and yet charges me very heavily for saying either a better assertion, or no worse than Mr. *Nyes*.

My assertion is this, If Jesus Christ shall by the hand of the Magistrate set a faithful Minister in the Parish, he becomes thereby as to Office and right a Pastor, a Guide, a Minister, and Teacher to their Souls. If they receive him not, they are Rebels and Traytors against Christ, and are no longer Christian people, save as an Adulterous Wife that breaks the Bond of Wedlock, may be called a Wife, *Mat. 10. 14, 15. Whosoever shall not receive you, nor hear your words: when ye depart out of that House or City, shake off the dust of your feet. Verily I say unto you, it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrhah, in the day of judgment, than for that City.* This is my assertion, save only that I cite the bare Text, *Mat. 10. 14, 15.* but do not recite the words. I have wished in my self before Mr. *Baxters* Book came out, that I had used other words than those of

Rebels and Traytors. But take my assertion as it is. Mr. Baxter in twelve particulars charges me heavily. Alas, where can we say a man will stop when he is once tumbling down the hill, pag. 169. of his Book against me. And pag. 172. *What Schismatick doth condemn so many Christians and Churches, as this Censure?* You see here my crime and my charge. Now compare my saying with Mr. Nye, *The Christian Magistrate may set up teachers all over his Dominions, whom the people upon his command are bound to hear: but to take any for their Pastors, he thought they might not be compelled.* This assertion Mr. Baxter approves, or doth not disapprove. Understand me candidly, as with Justice and Charity you may, and what more do I say than Mr. Nye? He says, the Christian Magistrate may set up Teachers all over his Dominions, whom the people upon his Command are bound to hear. I say, if Christ by the hand of the Magistrate set a faithful Minister in the Parish, he thereby becomes as to Office and right, a Pastor, a Guide, and Teacher to their Souls, and the people are bound to receive him. I did of purpose as most material, put in the word *faithful*, so doth not Mr. Nye. I see not but that this assertion is as good and safe as his, yea rather better, worse it is not. I cannot conceive why he should approve the one and not the other, except it be for this cause, that Mr. Nye makes a difference between Pastors and Teachers, and I make Pastors, and Teachers, and Ministers to be all one. And I stand to my assertion in that, that there is no difference between one that is by Office and Calling a Teacher in Gods Church, and one that

is by Office and Calling a Pastor in Gods Church, *Jer. 3. 15.* I will give you Pastors according to mine heart, which shall feed you with knowledge and understanding. The Pastors Office is set down, *Mat. 28. 19, 20.* Go and teach all Nations, baptizing them; &c. teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the World, *Amen. 1 Cor. 1. 17.* Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel. See also *Act. 20. 20, 28, 31. 2 Tim. 4. 1, 2.* Those are the most excellent Pastors who are the most excellent, powerful, holy, faithful, and successful Teachers. I am sure Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God. And how shall they hear without a Preacher? and how shall they preach except they be sent? *Rom. 10. 14, 15, 17.* The godly King *Jehosaphat* sent Priests and Levites to teach in the Cities of *Judah*. And they taught in *Judah*, and had the Book of the Law of the Lord with them, and went about throughout all the Cities of *Judah*, and taught the people. And the fear of the Lord fell upon all the Kingdoms of the Lands that were round about *Judah*, *2 Chr. 17. 7, 8, 9, 10.* compared with that forecited, *Jer. 3. 15.* I will give you Pastors according to my heart, which shall feed you with knowledge and understanding. If the King and Parliament shall set ordained faithful Ministers in every Parish throughout *England*, will Mr. *Baxter* say, that these Ministers so placed are not by Office Pastors to all the Souls in the Parishes respectively? Are not the people bound to thank God for such a King and Parliament, and for such

faithful Guides, Pastors, and spiritual Overseers set over them? Their wills are their own. No man can compel them to do ought against their wills. But whether they hear them or no, submit to them or no, like them or turn from them; the Ministers so placed are by Office and Calling Pastors in Gods Church, and particularly to their several Parishes. They shall know that a Pastor was among them, and sent them from the Lord. My meaning was not nor is to exclude the Patrons right in presenting, nor the Bishops right in Ordaining, and putting the Pastor in the place; I suppose and include both. My scope was and is to undermine that gross conceit that there must be a Covenant between Pastor and people, as between Husband and Wife; and that a godly just ordained and duly qualified Minister is no Pastor, till there pass a mutual Covenanting knot between him and the people, I take thee for my Pastor, I take thee for one of my Flock. And so by this means the people must be bound to own godly Teachers set over them by the Magistrate for Teachers, and hear them: but they be under no Bond to own them for Pastors till a mutual Covenant pass between them as between Husband and Wife, and they may chuse or refuse to join in the Lords Supper and Baptism. These are priviledges says Mr. Bartlet in his model, pag. 74, 75. out of Mr. Burroughs heart divisions, pag. 166. *that belong not to Saints as Saints; but to Saints as gathered into a Society under Officers: they suppose that till the Saints be joined to a particular Church by mutual Covenant and Combination, they are under no power, nor Discipline of any Church,*



Church, they have no right to the Seals of the Covenant. They make nothing of our being baptized, and godly persons, and dwellers, or sojourners in the Parish. All this is nothing with them to the being of Pastor and people, without a special agreement, consent, or Covenant mutually. If Mr *Baxters* Cure of Church-Divisions were no better than this, it were sad. *Cyprian saith*: They that live in Discord and difference, and have not Peace with their Brethren, though they were slain for the name of Christ, yet cannot escape the crime of dissension with Brethren. Because it is written, *He that hateth his Brother is a Murderer: and ye know that no Murderer hath eternal life abiding in him.* He cannot live with Christ that had rather imitate *Judas* than Christ: what a sin is this which cannot be washed away with a Baptism of blood? what a crime that cannot be expiated by a Martyrdom? *Cyprian. in O-rat. Dom. f. 18. pag. 315.* Now how can it stand with Christian goodness and charity to tell the people that faithful Ministers placed by the Magistrate in all the Parishes throughout his Dominions, are not lawful Pastors? You are bound to hear them, but not to own them for Pastors, not to join with them in the Sacraments, not to look upon them as those that have just charge over your Souls by the Laws of God and the King? If you say this, it is high Schism. If you say it not, I will not charge it: I have plainly said, that though Parish bounds be of general conveniency, and no man causlessly is to break them; yet the Salvation of the Soul, and the glory of God, and the interest of the Church, is the supream Law,  
unto

unto which Parish-bounds and humane Orders are to give place. Let the people please God, and look well to their Souls, and govern themselves and Families in his fear; and it is less matter to what Church or Pastor they go. If they be guilty of some weakness, we must as wise and gentle Nurses bear with them, and neither humour them in sin, nor discourage their good endeavours. I hope this is no such dreadful, unchristianizing Doctrine as you charge my other words with.

Had I charged the people for not receiving an unfaithful Minister, set in the Parish by the Magistrate, I should have looked for many a hard word then. Or if I had said, where there is no Christian Magistrate, the people are to be without Pastors, this had been a sad saying. But when there is a Magistrate who takes care of the Church, and by his Order and direction faithful Ministers are set in the Parishes, you cannot deny but that faithful Ministers are the Embassadors of Christ, he that heareth them, heareth Christ; and he that despiseth them, despiseth Christ, and he that despiseth Christ despiseth God, *Luk. 10. 16.* whosoever shall not receive them, nor hear their words, shall be judged greater sinners in the day of judgment than *Sodom* and *Gomorrha*. Have I said any more than this? and is not this according to Gods word? The spirit of God teacheth all his to say, *Blessed be he that cometh to us in the name of the Lord.* If the Temple and Tythes be the Magistrates, and he shall set a faithful Minister therein, *ubi Episcopus*

*in Ecclesia*, where is the Pastor there is the Crib, the people are bound to hear him, to receive him as a faithful Minister of Christ, they are bound to it by the Laws of God and the King. As when the Trumpet sounds, every man is to prepare himself to the Battel, and gather to his proper Standard and Captain: so when the Lords Minister set in place by the Magistrate shall in the Temple the place of Gods publick worship faithfully preach Gods word, and pray and minister Gods holy Ordinances, and proclaim the Lords message, and open War against sin, the World, and the Devil; it is the duty of the sworn enlisted Souldiers of Jesus Christ of that Parish to gather to their proper Captain and Standard: if they be Christs Sheep, they will keep to Christs Crib, and own him for their Pastor, who is so by the Laws of God and the King. If they refuse such Pastors because they are set in place by the Magistrate, their sin is rather worse than less. If it be the Office of the Magistrate to be a nursing Father to the Church, wherein can he better shew that he is so, than by setting faithful Ministers in all Parishes throughout his Dominions? Shall godly King *Jehosaphat* be blamed for sending faithful Priests and Levites to teach in all the Cities of *Judah*? or shall the people say, we receive you not, you are obtruded upon us, you are no godly Pastors of Souls unless we consent; we consent not to you, we disallow you, we will hear and receive none such; shall the people say and do thus, and be blameless? Can they pray the Lords Prayer, *thy Kingdom come, thy will be done, hallowed be thy name, lead us not into temptation,*

*tion, but deliver us from evil*; can they pray these Petitions, and not receive and welcom faithful Ministers sent them by the Magistrate? Can they love God, and not love faithful Ministers? Can they renounce the World, the Flesh and the Devil, can they be duly subject to the Higher Powers, can they follow the things which make for Peace, can they be wise as the Serpent, and innocent as the Dove, can they discharge a good Conscience, and not receive welcom and be thankful for a faithful Minister set over them by Gods Magistrate? My assertion is of faithful Ministers. Faithful Ministers will prove themselves such by their Doctrine, by their faithful living, and just discharge of their Office. As the Sun is known by its own light: so true godliness in Ministers is its own evidence: and will be perceived by all whom Satan the God of this World hath not blinded, and whose hearts are not poisoned with heresie, ungodliness, and reigning vice. And if they shall call darkness light, and light darkness; and call those unfaithful who are faithful, and those faithful who are unfaithful, there is a wo pronounced against them.

You ask me who must judge of Ministers faithfulness and qualifications? I ask you if learning be any qualification of a Minister? If not, why have we Schools and Universities? how shall the Scriptures be translated and understood? how shall we understand Hebrew, Greek, and Latine Authors, the knowledge whereof is so much conducing to the knowledge of the Scriptures, the defence of Religion, the Confutation of Heresy maintained by learned Hereticks and published

in a language not understood by the vulgar multitude? How shall the reputation of the Ministry be kept up if all Ministers be unlearned? If learning be one qualification of a Minister, then declare how the unlearned as most of the vulgar multitude are, can be Judges of a Ministers learning? how can they that know nothing but English, examine, prove, and try others in learning, as Latine, Greek, Hebrew? Suppose all the Parish be infected with Arrianism, and the Magistrate send an Orthodox and faithful Minister to convert them, and place him in the Parish, shall the people of the Parish be Judges of him who is sent to convert them? Suppose the Parish be divided, some are Anabaptists, some Papists, some Quakers, some Infidels, some Arminians, some Calvinists, some for set Forms, some not, some are sincere Christians, and the greater part are carnal, some are Infants and Children in minority, some are Ideots, some are Prentices and Servants; Which of all these would you have to be chusers, Judges and tryers of the fitness, faithfulness, and qualifications of the Minister to be set over them, or already set over them by the Magistrate? I confess if I were of your opinion, and the Independents, that mutual Covenanting and consent is that which founds the relation between Pastor and people, as between Husband and Wife, the Case were soon decided: according to this Doctrine I see not but Pagans and gross Hereticks, and Apostates, and Thieves, and Robbers, might combine together, and say, I take thee for my Pastor, and I take you for my people. Here is Election and Combination. But I know



know you are far from owning such Combinations. But doth not your Doctrine infer it?

*Obj.* Though it belong to the people to chuse their Minister, yet they may not chuse any that are unfit.

*Ans.* No more may the man chuse an unfit Woman for his Wife, nor the Woman an unfit Man for her Husband. But fit or not fit, they chuse and Covenant for better for worse, Pagan or Christian, it is a valid Covenant and Marriage, they are lawful Husband and Wife, and not Fornicators.

I have told you that it is qualification and Ordination that makes Christian Pastors at large. If the Pastor set over the people by the Magistrate be a Wolf, the people are to turn from him. And wherein have I contradicted these sayings? what ground then had you, so heavily to charge me as one of the rankelt Schismatics, and as if I were tumbling headlong into some fearful Apostasie and delusion? Do I say that the Magistrate is to ordain Ministers? I say no such thing. I give no more to the Magistrate than what you and Mr Nye do allow. I do not infringe the peoples right, except you will say it is their right to be licentious, and to turn from faithful Teachers set over them. You and Mr Nye say, they are bound to hear them. But how shall the people know whether they be such Teachers as they may and are bound to hear? Answer your own case and you answer mine. If they can discern them faithful Teachers, they can so far discern them to be faithful Pastors. If they faithfully do the Pastors part by teaching publicly and

and privately, and warning every one night and day in all humility and love, if these be not just and godly Pastors of Souls, I would know who are?

But here is the heart of the matter, Dr. Ames, Mr. T. Hooker, and those of their way say, as I have before cited their words, that to talk of a Pastor at large, is as ridiculous as to say a Husband without a Wife. They make Pastor and people to be correlates, *simul natura, unum uni*, so that where is the one there is the other. If I shall retort their own words, and say their opinion is ridiculous and worse, I shall be judged an Admirer of mine own wisdom, and a despiser of men eminently above me. And if I yield to their assertion, I must subvert the Office of Christ and his Apostles, and all his faithful Ministers, and all the Churches to this day; which I will not do for fear of the censure of any man living, no nor of a whole Council of men. You intimate as if I were against the peoples right in the choice of their Ministers. I will tell you what I am against. I am against Confusion, and making the blind Judges of the seeing, and the unlearned of the learned, and pleasing people to their hurt, and deposing Christ, and Scripture, and Godliness, and faithful Ministers, Prophets, Apostles and Martyrs by the votes of the people. I am against his words and opinion, who would have no Minister that loves the Lord Jesus better than his own belly, stand upon his ad vocation from his Patron, but rather expect his vocation from his people. Mr. Cotton in his way of the Churches in New England, c. 7. s. 2. p. 111. And I am against their opinion

opinion who would have every single Congregation to consist of five distinct Officers, a ruling Elder, a Doctor, a Teacher, a Deacon, a Deacons, as necessary by divine Law, and to be multiplied and encreased according to the bigness of the people, but so that every the least Congregation must be judged in-compleat that wants any of the five. And all these must be chosen and consented to before-hand by the people of the particular Congregation, or they are no right Officers: and either there needs no Ordination, or it is but like crowning to the King. And every such Church so constituted is an University, a Convocation or Synod, and a self-subsistent body under Christ, having power to visit Churches, to ordain Ministers, to exercise all the Ordinances of Christ. I am against all this, and all other the consequential errors which flow from this Doctrine of a particular Church-Covenant, *tanquam ex equo Trojano*; grant the principle, and there is no withstanding of them.

But though I am against this, I will tell you what I am not against. I would have Magistrates, Ministers and people to fear God, and among them to have a care that none but worthy and well-qualified men be chosen, ordained, and set apart for the Ministry. The lowest rank of Church-Officers should not be common men. Deacons are to excel the vulgar multitude, Presbyters are to excel Deacons, and Bishops are to excel Presbyters. When there is a great scarcity of Ministers, the Church must make use of such as she can get; better a Loaf than no Bread, as *Grindal* tells *Queen Elizabeth* in his excellent Letter

way

venge wrong, and to see that all be orderly, and each one keep in his place.

If still you shall say, this is no Answer to the point, who must be judge of Ministers fitness and qualification?

*Ans.* It lays down those generals which do secure the Office and Calling, the interest of the Church, and the just concurrent right of all parties concerned. Let the matter light how it will, so be it substantial and fit men be chosen and ordained, it can make nothing for but against the Independent Doctrine of a particular Church Covenant, as essential to the being of Pastor and people, as the Covenant between Man and Woman is to the making of Husband and Wife. Every man is to discern his own duty, and for that end to use all meet helps. If he be sincere for the main, and err through frailty, God will mercifully forgive him. If he err grossly, his error will not alter Gods Law, and make that to be no sin which is gross sin. Christ says, beware of Wolves and false Prophets: ye shall know them by their Fruits. Faithful people are taught of God, and they can discern between the righteous and the wicked, the voice of Christ and of Satan. If people be unfaithful, they are inexcusable. The Pastors Office is to make them faithful, and able to make a godly choice. As men are, so they will chuse, whether Magistrates, Pastors or people. To such as say it belongs chiefly to the people to chuse Ministers, I would commend to read *Mr. Pool. Quo Warranto* against Lay mens Preaching.

I will crave leave to transcribe a passage out of



*your Saints Rest Part. 1. c. 7. f. 14. p. 111.* "Did  
 "I not think, that of all other, the scorning all  
 "the worshippers of Christ, had been a sure sign  
 "of a wicked wretch? But I see now we must  
 "distinguish between scorner and scorner, or  
 "else I fear we shall exclude almost all.

This passage of yours I apply to a defence of  
 my words, for which you do so heavily charge  
 me. Did I not think it a sure sign of a wicked  
 man, not to receive a faithful Minister set in his  
 Parish by the Magistrate? But I see now we must  
 distinguish between refusers and refusers of faith-  
 ful Ministers so placed, or else I fear we shall ex-  
 clude almost all the faithful. You go on and  
 say.

*Obj.* "But is it possible such should be truly  
 "godly? Then what sin will denominate a man  
 "ungodly?

*Ans.* "Or else I must believe the Doctrine of  
 "the Saints Apostasie; or believe there are scarce  
 "any godly in the World. I see not but your words  
 will fit my Case. One would think that those  
 persons whose case in the day of judgment shall  
 be worse than *Sodom* and *Gomorrah*, of all other  
 were wicked Wretches. And such by Christs  
 words are they who do not welcom and receive  
 faithful Ministers sent unto them, *Mat. 10. 14, 15.*  
 But I perceive by your words against me, that ei-  
 ther such persons must be accounted godly, or  
 else we must believe the Doctrine of the Saints  
 Apostasie, or believe there are scarce any godly  
 in the World. I can believe neither of these two  
 last, and therefore I must necessarily believe the  
 other. And here I entreat you by the way to at-

low me this Answer as to a weighty passage in my Book, where I judge the silencing of so many faithful Ministers, for Inconformity to things confessed in their own nature indifferent, to be a great and dreadful sin. For my part I judge so still. I dare not say that it is a light sin. One would think no godly man could be guilty of such a sin. But if I should think silencing of Ministers for such causes to be the sin of the ungodly only, I fear I should sentence for ungodly multitudes who have been silencers of faithful Ministers for such Causes, and yet sincerely godly for the main. An eminent Non-Conformist, Mr. Capel in his *Apology*, pag. 282. hath these words. "I doubt not but a godly man may for the matter do the act of any sin whatsoever except the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost; though he holds he cannot die impenitently in any sin. The Lord be merciful to us, and save us from our selves. If there be such wretched nature in us, when sanctified, what are we when unsanctified, and what are we when left unto our selves! O how glad would the Primitive Christians have been of a Magistrate that would have placed faithful Ministers over all his Dominions! Is it not a great temptation to Magistrates to turn Infidels, and destroyers rather than Protectors of the Church, if when they shall set up faithful Ministers throughout their Dominions, the people may both be godly, and yet not own and receive such for their Pastors? what would not damned Souls give for such Pastors? How glad would they be if they might but once more enjoy the labours of such Ministers? I had thought such Ministers worthy of acceptance though

though the Magistrate should not send them, yea though he should forbid them. How much more when he doth countenance and protect them, and duly serves God by promoting the Kingdom of Christ in his Dominions, appointing to each people a godly, faithful, and just Ordained Minister? How did it glad the heart of that holy man *Ezra*, when the Heathen King *Artaxerxes* made a gracious and favourable Decree concerning the Temple and State of the Jews, *Ezra* 7. 27, 28?

If the Magistrate misexecute his Office, and displace and turn out faithful Ministers, and set in place unworthy and unfaithful ones, that doth not weaken my assertion. I plead for no such thing. I do but defend his placing of faithful Ministers, duly qualified and ordained, against their opinion who say such Ministers are not lawful Pastors till there pass a mutual Covenant, agreement, or engagement before hand between them and the people, as between Husband and Wife.

The Independents do greatly mistake us, and mistake the point, when they suppose as if we were against Church-Covenanting and Confederation, and would have Pastors and people to be either Slaves or Infidels. We do declare that we are not against but for a Church-Covenant and Confederation, as the common Form, Essence and being of all the Churches, and of all the faithful throughout the World. We would not have the Church to consist of coerced Slaves, and involuntary un-consenting persons. We would have all grown persons who are to be baptized, explicitly, solemnly, and sacredly to Covenant themselves

to God in Baptism. We would have Infants to be entred into this Covenant by their Parents, Owners, or Sureties, and when they come to Age to take it upon themselves. But we deny and withstand any other Church-Covenant, as necessary by any Law of God, or by any sound reason to the being of a particular Church.

The Author of *the brief instruction in the worship of God*, says plainly, "that the special Form of a particular Church, or that which doth differ-  
"ence it from all other Churches, is an holy  
"bond or special consent and agreement of all  
"the members of it, to walk together in the ob-  
"servance of all the Ordinances of the Gospel  
"numerically, and for the Communion of Saints.  
pag. 193, 194, 195. compared with pag. 77.

*Ans.* Now I reason thus. If all Churches have this same Bond, then it is no differencing Form. This doth not notifie and characterize one Church from another. If some Churches have this Bond, and others not, and there cannot be a Church without it, then either those Churches that have it, or those that have it not, are no true Churches of God. I cannot be of this Authors opinion, which is the same with Mr. *Baxter*: and the Independents, but either I must un-Church all the Independent Churches, or I must un-Church all but the Independent Churches, or else I must go against common sense and reason, and say, that there is no note, character, differencing Form, or Sign, by which *Peter* may be distinguished from *Paul*, and a Church in *England* from a Church in *Holland*.

I would desire those men who pretend to keep  
nearest

nearest to the Scripture rule, to keep to it, and to tell me where in all the Scriptures they find this word particular as joined to the word Church or Churches? They dispute of a particular Church, this is their common notion, they presume and build upon it. Why do they go from the Standard, since they will seem to be more exact than others? I read of the Church of God at *Corinth*, of the Church of the *Thessalonians*, of the seven Churches in *Asia*, of the Churches of *Judea*, and *Galatia*: but I no where read this phrase, A particular Church, and the particular Church, and particular Churches. Now I would know of any Independent Author, what is the differencing Form between the Church of God at *Corinth*, and the Church of God at *Jerusalem*, and the Church of God at *Ephesus*, and the like? Every one is alike a Church, and knit together in an holy Bond: this is common to all. In this only they differ, one is a Church or Society of Saints and Pastors dwelling at *Ephesus*, and in the neighbourhood thereof; another is a Society dwelling at *Jerusalem*, a third dwells at *Corinth*, and in the Neighbourhood thereof. Look whom the Apostle in one place calls a Church, and the Church of God, as at *Corinth*, *Thessalonica*; he doth elsewhere call Saints, the Saints which are at *Ephesus*, and the faithful in Christ Jesus, *Eph. 1. 1.* All the Saints in Christ Jesus, which are at *Philippi*, with the Bishops and Deacons, *Phil. 1. 1.*

If then this question be put, whom do you mean by the Church of God at *Kedermister*? Answer is to be made, all the Saints within the Parish of *Kedermister*, including Pastors and Officers.



ficere. But now the Independents they come with a new device, they set up a new Form of Churches: and none must be accounted the Church of God at *Kedermister*, but such Saints as shall bind themselves by a particular Bond to the Pastor of *Kedermister*, and he to them, and one to another. Such as refuse to engage in this Bond, though they be real Saints, godly people, and Inhabitants within the Parish of *Kedermister*, constant resorters to the Church, though they reverence and honour the Minister, and submit to his Ministry, yet doth the Independent Doctrine shut them out as no Saints and people of God at *Kedermister*, for no cause or reason but because they will not engage in this their Bond and Church Confederation.

Had St. Paul been to have directed an Epistle to the Church of God at *Kedermister*, he would have taken in and included all the faithful one and another usual Inhabitants within the Parish of *Kedermister*. Mr. Baxter gives account in his Book of Confirmation, of some godly persons in his Parish who did not expressly own a membership in the Church particular, whom yet he did admit to the Lords Supper upon the account as godly Strangers. Unto which I crave leave to Answer a word on two. What difference do you make between a godly man and a Church member? I suppose you will grant all godly persons to be Church-members, or else there will be no such thing as a Church in all the World. 2. You grant these persons to be godly, and to be dwellers in your Parish. How then can you repute them strangers, and as wayfaring men that turn

aside

aside  
to Ista  
day,  
consta  
strang

3.  
godly  
requir  
say wi  
more  
ber of  
man  
dwell  
godly  
make

4.  
perfec  
to y  
Conf  
they  
to C  
they  
ther

5.  
not  
do  
com  
Cov  
per  
bei  
to  
be  
as  
Ch

aside to tarry for a night? Jer. 14. 8. Says David to Ittai, Thou art a stranger, and a guest but yesterday, 2 Sam. 15. 19, 20. Sure the whole House and constant abode is in the Parish, is not a meet stranger or sojourning wayfaring man.

3. If these persons be by your own Confession godly persons and Inhabitants, what more do you require to make them members of your Church? say what, and prove it from Gods word that any more is necessary than this. Or what is any member of your Church more than these two, a godly man, and an Inhabitant within the Parish or dwelling near it, except it be that he be more godly, which your Church Covenant doth not make him?

4. By what Warrant do you admit these godly persons to the Lords Supper, if they consent not to your Church Covenant? If you admit Non-Consenters, you destroy your own Principle. If they be no Church members, they have no right to Church privileges. If they intrude before they have consented to your Covenant, you count them invaders.

5. Will you say they consent when they do not? you say they do not expressly consent. How do you prove that they do at all consent? Their coming to Church is no token of consent to your Covenant, nor their receiving of the Lords Supper, nor their dwelling in the Parish, nor their being godly people. All this doth not amount to a special Covenant, Consent, or Agreement to be a member of your Church, to submit to you as their Pastor, to hold Communion with your Church. They may be and do all the other, and utterly

utterly renounce your Church-Covenant, as having no foundation in Gods word.

6. It is plain that the people do not consent at all. For you call them to own themselves your charge, to consent to submit to you as their Pastor, and to be members of that Church, and hold Communion therewith, and you set down a particular Form. *I A. B. do consent to be a member of the particular Church of Christ, at ——— member of ——— Teacher, &c.* You tell them before-hand, if they be silent, it shall be taken as if they did not consent. And they are silent. If a Woman when she is brought to be Married, should refuse to pronounce the consenting Covenanting words, would any man say that she is the mans lawful Wife?

7. So then these godly persons your Neighbours and Inhabitants of the Parish are by their refusal to consent to your Church-Covenant Cashiered from being members of your particular Church. If they intrude into the Communion and privileges thereof, they are counted invaders.

8. Two things yet you have to say, which I have before hinted at. 1. That you can use them as godly strangers, and so admit them to the Lords Supper. But this is plainly to recede from your principle, and not to walk uprightly according to the truth of the Gospel, and to make no difference between constant Inhabitants and meet Strangers. 2. That you leave them members of the Church-Universal. But by this you condemn your self, you oppose Church and Church, You imagine your Church to be contrary to the Church Universal. If all other Churches must do as you, they must be cast out of all, the Lords people

people must be used as Dogs. *For without are Dogs, Rev. 22. 15.* Whither must they go? They are dwellers in your Parish, they are as true Saints as those that be Covenanted to you, they have as true right to Heaven, you have nothing against them but because they will not consent to a sinful Covenant of mans making.

*Obj.* But the Parish may be so large I cannot take charge of them all.

*Answ.* That's nothing to your Church-Covenant. Your Doctrine shuts them out of all Churches, and declares them to be no Saints, because they refuse to consent to one essential of Church-Communion. If you cannot watch over them, another may: but if that other and all Pastors and Churches must do as you, they must be shut out of all Churches, and judged no Church-members by your Doctrine.

---

*The*

## The Case of Ministers Conformity further argued with Mr Baxter.

SECT. I. **I** Grant if Conformity be in any point simply evil and unlawful, no man may submit to it. And you in your Disputations of Church-Government, pag. 460. as I am told by an Author that cites you, do say, *that if a thing be but inconvenient, or evil only by accident or circumstance, it is possible for the command of Governors to take off that accidental evil, and make it become a duty.* Thus far we are agreed. Of two sins neither is to be chosen. But if a man through his own sin and folly entangle himself in a necessity of sinning, and of doing a greater or a lesser sin, it is less sinful in him to do the less evil, and to avoid the greater. If a man be in doubt whether he may do this or that matter, and it is come to this, that either he must do it, or it will be worse both to himself and others, he is to go against his doubts. Where doubting stands in the way of duty, a man is to resolve against his doubts. An uncertain evil is to give place to a certain good. And a certain known good is to prevail against an uncertain evil, or the fear lest in doing this or that I err. I live in a Parish where the Conforming Minister is a godly man.

The



The Laws of Church and State enjoin me to hear him and join with him. I converse with many good Ministers and people, and with written Books, and they tell me I must not hear and join with this godly Conforming Minister, and I am cast into doubts and fears about my duty. In this case I am to join with the Parish Ministry, and prefer a known certain duty before uncertain fears. To hear Gods word preached, and his Ordinances dispensed by a godly Minister is lawful, much more when commanded by my superiours: this is plain and certain. Therefore my doubts and scruples are not to be yielded to, but I am to lay them by and go against them, or do my duty and what is certain with a cautelous mind, rather than forbear and not do it at all. The Magistrate makes a Law that all shall sit at the Sacrament or be debarred. A scrupulous Christian understanding from the original Text that the gesture in which Christ gave the Sacrament, was more like to lying or leaning than sitting, he begins to doubt whether he may sit or no. In this case he is to prefer a certain duty which is going to the Sacrament, and not offending the Magistrate, before an uncertain evil or the fear that sitting is not lawful. Zanchy writing to the English Ministers to Conform, says, *They who ever consulted the Scriptures, or Fathers, or Ecclesiastical Historians, will need no proof of this. That it can never be lawful for men to leave a necessary employment for the sake of indifferent Rules, as the wearing of a white Garment.* But now I am cast into doubts whether this be an indifferent thing. I doubt I may not use it. In this case a certain duty

is to prevail against an uncertain doubtful small evil. You will say, I do not forsake my Ministry. I can exercise it in a suffering state. But are you certain that you do not sin in not wearing the Garment, and that all things considered it was not better to use it? This is the Case, I doubt either way; I doubt I sin, if I do not conform; I doubt I sin if I do conform; the wearing of the Garment being but an uncertain evil, prudence, and piety, and compassion to Souls make it a duty in case of deprivation to wear it, though you should wear it partly with a doubting mind. He that doubteth is damned if he eat. And the Magistrate requiring me upon a civil and politic account to eat, I doubt I am damned if I eat not. In this Case I conceive it is my wisest way to eat rather than not. If the Magistrate had made no Law, the Case were clear, I might forbear, though perhaps I should not be without some superstition in my mind. But when he hath made a Law, that for civil and politic ends and reasons I shall eat, I am to yield to a certain duty rather than forbear for fear of an uncertain evil.

*Sect. 2.* Between lax and rigid interpretation there is a safe mean which is just interpretation. In this middle sense I do firmly hold, and freely confess, that Oaths are *stricti juris*. I never thought any other. In no other sense can it hold true. If a test of Gods own making cannot concord good men in all things, why should it be thought strange if a test of mans making cannot do it? Can men speak more plainly than God? If the Conformists do not understand every thing

in Conformity alike, is that any wonder? Did the late Covenanters in *England, Scotland, and Ireland* understand every thing in the Covenant alike? I am certain they did not. I could easily prove it by substantial, undeniable evidence. Did not they go from the letter in the expounding of the words of that Covenant? You have reason to be sparing in your Censures of Conformity for the sake of the solemn League and Covenant, and of those which took it. Allow the Conformists but as much latitude as you allow to the takers of that Covenant, and the Conformists will desire no more to the upholding of their subscriptions to Conformity, and the absolving of themselves from all crime in Conformity. But this is but *little*. I mean not to answer anew to every thing in your Book against me. The particulars are too many. I will speak to such as I apprehend most difficult, and you most rely on, and are of greatest weight in the cause, and with what brevity I can, though I injure my self and the matter something. Let no man be prejudiced against what I shall say, because I am *impar congressus* with him. My great sorrow and discouragement is, that I write against a most eminent and now aged Servant of God, and my most loving, entire, and faithful Friend.

§ 3. I have produced divers reasons to prove that the Law doth not look upon Ordination by Presbyters to be a nullity. You are pleased to tell me, *I may next say, that any thing that I see or hear* thereof. These are my reasons. 1. The positive Laws against Non-Conformists, and Executions thereon. They do not punish you as meer Lay men,

Lay-men, but as Ministers, as Clerks, as men in holy Orders, refusing to conform to the Law. A supposed Schismatical Minister is supposed a Minister. Do but look over the penal Laws against Conventicles and Non-Conformists, together with Ecclesiastical and Civil Processes, Tryals, and Executions thereon, and I believe that they endite and punish you as Clerks, and Ministers, and not as bare Lay-men. As when Priests and Jesuits are endited for being so, and others are endited for harbouring them, that is a proof that the Law doth put a clear difference between a Popish Lay-man and a Popish Priest. But let no man think hence that I do equal Papists and Non-Conformists. God forbid. 2. The Kings Indulgence some years ago by his Proclamation to the Non-Conformists, and granting them Licence under his Seal to make them meeting places, and officiate as Ministers, and commanding the Magistrate not to disturb them. I do not think that the King, Parliament, and Bishops do take all for Ministers, Men, Women, and Children, whose meetings they tolerate. But I have reason to think, that when the King made his gracious Declaration concerning Ecclesiastical Affairs, soon after his return, and joined sundry Presbyterial Ministers (as I suppose) in Commission with Episcopal Divines to treat about the alteration of the Liturgy, that he did not repute Presbyterial Ministers to be no Ministers, but Lay-men. And that when he issued forth his Proclamation, and granted the Non-Conformists Licence to Officiate, he did not License them to invade the sacred Office, and allow Lay-men to preach,

preach, baptize, give the Lords Supper, &c.  
 3. The Act of Uniformity it self exempts the  
 Foreigners of Reformed Churches from the pe-  
 nalties thereof. Would the King and Parlia-  
 ment allow Foreigners of reformed foreign Churches  
 publickly to set up Churches, baptize, preach,  
 give the Lords Supper, and do all other Ministe-  
 rial Acts, if they took them to be meer Lay men?  
 The proof lyeth on your part. Prove that the  
 King and Parliament do repute the Dutch and  
 French Ministers to be no Ministers, but mere  
 Lay men, and sacrilegious Invaders of the  
 sacred Office. 4. The common sense of  
 the people of *England*, both Rulers and ruled.  
 They take the silenced Ministers for Ministers,  
 and the Ministers of foreign reformed Churches.  
 The contrary opinion of some singular persons,  
 cannot overweigh the sense and judgment of the  
 main Body, both of Clergy and Laity, supreme  
 and subordinate Rulers. 5. The Law alloweth  
 the meeting of four or five for religious exerci-  
 ses, besides those of the Family, and therein in-  
 cludeth Non-conforming Presbyterian Ministers.  
 6. The five-mile Act alloweth Ministers ordain-  
 ed by Presbyters only, to dwell in Cities and Cor-  
 porations, in case they will take the Oath there  
 set down, without being Episcopally ordained.  
 7. If the Law judge Presbyterian Ordination to  
 be null, then why doth it not order those that have  
 been baptized by such Ministers, to be baptized  
 again? I have read the Conferences at *Hampton*  
*Court*, and do well remember that King *James*  
 said, The Minister is of the essence of doing Ba-  
 ptism well and rightly as it should be done. If



Women may baptize, why may they not also preach, and give the Lords Supper, and ordain Ministers, and excommunicate, and absolve? *Similem similem est ratio.* I could add more reasons, but these are enough.

*Sett. 4.* I maintain, That Ministers presbyterially ordained may be, and in case of deprivation are bound to be Episcopally ordained, were that all that is required of them. It is no impli-  
cite Lye. David was thrice anointed King, 1 Sam. 16. 13. 2 Sam. 2. 4. 2 Sam. 5. 3. Solomon was twice made and anointed King, 1 King. 1. 39. 1 Chron. 29. 22. It is probable that Zadock also was twice anointed Priest. So doth Mr. Ross in his *View of all Religions*, pag. 8. collect. The Apostles had no less than three or four distinct Ordinations and Commissions, Luke 6. 13. *Matth.* 3. 13, 14, 15. *Matth.* 10. 1, 2, 5. *Matth.* 16. 19. *John* 20. 21, 22, 23. *Mark* 16. 15. *Matth.* 28. 18, 19, 20. Paul and Barnabas seem to have been ordained the second time, *Acts* 13. 1, 2, 3. The Russians use to re-baptize their Proselyte-Christians. The Armenian Christians re-baptize their Converts from the Latin Church. The Maronites hold, That Hereticks (perhaps it is meant of persons baptized by Hereticks; or Converts from Heresie) are to be re-baptized. So saith Mr. Ross in his *View of all Religions*, pag. 483, 490, 493. You grant the outward part in Ordination may be repeated. And there are but two parts in it, the inward and the outward: both are to concur, or there will be hypocrisy. As the inward and outward man make but one man, so the conjunction of the inward with the

outward man make but one Ordination. *Koffi*  
 in his Book *de Baptismo*, having largely treated  
 of re-baptization, names a great many weak and  
 insufficient reasons against it, and relies upon  
 this one to my best remembrance (having not the  
 Book by me) that we have no warrant save for  
 once Baptism, it is a positive institution of God,  
 and we may not go from it. But if this reason  
 hold, what warrant is there in constituted Churches  
 for Women and Lay-mens baptizing? The  
 Command or Commission is to the Apostles  
 and ordinary Ministers. As for that reason, that  
 nothing is of the essence of Baptism, but the  
 matter and form; why may not the same be said  
 of preaching, giving the Lords Supper, Ordination,  
 Excommunication, and of the Office of  
 Judges, Justices, Magistrates, &c. I say not  
 that a Child baptized by a Woman is not bound  
 to perform the Baptismal Vow: But that a  
 Child so baptized is not to be again baptized by a  
 lawful Minister, I could gladly see well and sound-  
 ly proved. Divines allow that form of Baptism  
 in a doubtful case, If thou art not baptized, I  
 baptize thee, &c. But who sees not that this is  
 absolute Baptism? The annexed condition is of  
 no force. For whether he was baptized before  
 or no, you do absolutely baptize him now. If  
 re-baptization be so horrible a thing, it should  
 rather be said, for fear of doing a horrible sin I  
 dare not venture to baptize you. What warrant  
 had David and his men to eat of the shew bread,  
 which, saith Christ expressly, was not lawful for  
 him to eat, but only for the Priests, *Mark* 12:  
 3, 4. And what warrant from the letter of the

Law had *Hezekiah* to keep Festival seven days more, and to keep the Passover for all the Congregation in the second Month? And what warrant had *Mordecai* and *Esther* from the Letter of the Law to institute the Feast of *Purim* yearly for all the Jews, throughout their Generations? If *Paul*, willing to become all things to all men, did use an abolished Ordinance of God, in circumcising *Timothy*, wherein is it sinful in like cases and circumstances simply to repeat Ordination? They who think re-ordination to be horrible, would do well to prove re marriage horrible, and shew what such odds there is between the Case of re marriage lately in *England*, and the now Case of re-ordination. You were wont to solve the matter with a distinction, that they are twice marriage Physically, but not Morally. But your silence against my alledged Reasons makes me think you discern that will not hold. It is not required by the Law, that Ministers Episcopally ordained, be again ordained; but that all that will be lawful Ministers of the Church of *England*, be Episcopally ordained. I grant I have said, That Ordination once done by grave and substantial Presbyters makes compleat Ministers, and that if the Presbyters do excel the Bishop, Ordination by them is more excellent than by him. But let no man understand my words against my meaning. As my meaning was not to diminish ought from the Presbyters right, so neither was it my meaning to exclude the Bishop, and diminish ought from his right. Where no Bishops are, Presbyters may and must ordain. Where Bishops are, the Bishop is to be of the *Quorum*,  
and

and no Ordination regularly is to be without him. I must needs think, that as is the man, so will be his work: and that if the Presbyter do excel the Bishop in wisdom, holiness, and mental qualifications, he will do holy duties and exercises more holily. This may be, and yet the Bishops office and dignity not be invaded, nor despised, nor his part excluded from Ordination. The more eminent the Presbyters are, the more humble, wise and reverend they will be, the more they will reverence the Bishop, and keep up the reputation of his office and person in the Church, and make no Ordinations without him, where his concurrence may be had. All sides agree, That Ordination by a Bishop and Presbyters is compleat; but all sides do not agree, That Ordination by Presbyters without a Bishop is compleat; where a Bishop may be had. Therefore for peace sake some are to yield to all, rather than all to some, in a point consistent with the principles of all. I have also said, That all Pastors of souls be Bishops in the proper sense, though not in the vulgar sense. For this Mr. *Allop* seems to taunt me. But let him say what he pleases. Moderate Episcopal Divines will confess, That the word translated *Bishop* in Scripture doth indifferently agree to Presbyters. And I dare not say the Scripture speaks improperly. And he that shall hence quarrel with the vulgar sense, and condemn that which by long use and the custome of all the Churches is become familiar, and the common language of all the Churches, may shew more niceness and self-conceit, than sound wisdom and peaceableness. It is use

which is the great vice of speech, *Quam penes ar-*  
*bitrium est & jus & norma loquendi.* 11 Sam. 9. 9.  
*He that is now called a Prophet, was before a time call-*  
*ed a Seer.* But Mr. Alsop charges me deeply, be-  
 cause I have said, That to repeat Ordination, &c.  
 in urgent cases, as to save life or liberty, is not  
 unlawful, nor any taking of Gods name in vain,  
 should it be done many times. *At this rate then,*  
*said Mr. Alsop, what sin may not be warrantable?*  
*for there's none greater than that of taking of Gods*  
*name in vain.* *Ans.* What! not Murther; nor  
 Adultery, nor Perjury, nor Idolatry, nor Witch-  
 craft, nor Atheism, nor Blasphemy, nor the sin  
 against the Holy Ghost? Sure your wisdom or  
 your charity failed you here. Did Blessed Cypri-  
 an, and the rest of the *Carthage* Fathers, com-  
 mit the most dreadful sin, when they did errone-  
 ously, as most think, set up re-baptization? Or  
 do godly Anabaptists among us commit the  
 greatest sin, when through error they yield to  
 be re-baptized? Or do you think the ancient  
 Churches committed the most heinous sin, when  
 they did for many years not advisedly, as most  
 think, admit little ones to partake of the Lords  
 Supper? Or will you say, That so often as ho-  
 nest Ministers and Christians do in Prayer and  
 Conference needlessly repeat the name of God,  
 and toss it too frequently in their mouths, that  
 they commit the most heinous sin? Had you  
 said, *At this rate* who knows how often Or-  
 dination may be repeated? your words had had  
 more reason and charity. I could wish I had for-  
 born those words *many times.* But take them as  
 they are, and they will admit of a stop at the  
 third



third time. And I could wish I had said no more than was necessary to my Cause, or that I had rather said, Perhaps it is lawful in urgent cases, as to save life or liberty, to be re-baptized. But admit the utmost, That it is sinful to hold re-baptization and re-ordination lawful in any sense, or for any reason, and to yield to be re-baptized, and re-ordained, would it be the greatest sin? would such an error, not perceived by him that holds it, un-godly him? doth such an opinion lay a foundation for all sin? I see that wise men may overstrain.

*Sect. 5.* I have declared my sense of the three Orders of Ministers in the Church, Bishops, Priests and Deacons, as consistent with the principles of all that fear God. The Bishop hath power by his Office, and by the Catholicon, to adjudge and determine my Subscription in this to be sufficient. Methinks, you that hold Bishops or general Officers in the Church, to be as Colonels, and Parish Ministers to be as Captains, should readily grant that they are two distinct Orders.

*Sect. 6.* Concerning the Bishops Oath to the Arch-bishop, you grant if it were but obeying them in Civils, or *circa sacra*, in matters determinable by the King, my answer had much in it. Episcopal Divines themselves do grant that Arch-bishops and Metropolitans are of Civil Constitutions, and that they hold their places as Arch-bishops of the Magistrate. And if the Magistrate shall require the Bishops to swear obedience to the Arch-bishop, and to his Seat or Metropolitan Church, and to his Successors in such sort as would have been their duty without an

Oath, it is lawful to swear it. You mistake the matter when you say, That Diocesan Bishops are Arch-bishops. For they are not of the same rank with the Parish Ministers, but they are *Episcopi Pastorum* or *Presbyterorum*, Diocesan-Superintendents, as so many Colonels over the Captains: and the Arch bishop is as the head Colonel, the chief of all the Superintendents. As for your exception against swearing to their Successours, doth it not equally make against regal Successours? The Nation of *England* swore Allegiance to King *Edward* the VI. and his Successors. We know what a sad Successour he had, *Queen Mary*. I could wish this Oath to the Arch-bishop were forborn; but that it is simply unlawful, being enjoined by the Magistrate, I dare not say. It is an Oath respecting the outward order and polity of the Church, binding to no more whether *in sacris* or *circa sacra*, than what would have been their duty for order and concord sake, if no such Oath had been imposed and taken. Your opinion and Mr. *Hudson's*, with others, That particular Churches are parts of the Church Universal, as a City of a Kingdom, or as the Jewish Synagogues were of the Jewish Church, doth directly lead to a Pope, as supreme Ecclesiastical Monarch under Christ over all the Churches, as I have elsewhere opened and proved.

*Self. 7.* Our Oath or Covenant to the Ordinary, means no more since the Church-Canons, than it did before, and would have done, if the present Church-Canons had never been made. You know they were but made in King *James's* time. They are no Law of Parliament. They bind but

Mini-

Ministers in such sort as they bind Magistrates and private Christians, the Kings Subjects. They are no part of Subscription. To say it is plainly to add to the Law, you seem to rely much upon the Letter of the Church-Canons in your reasonings against Conformity. I have reason to take Conformity in most points as it was taken by the first Compilers of the Liturgy, before those Canons were made. I grant that Laws are not the Laws of the dead, but of the living: but when the living shall plainly tell us in the Preface before the Liturgy, *That the main body and essentials of it (as well in the chiefest materials, as in the frame and order thereof) have still continued the same unto this day, and do yet continue firm and unshaken.* Then if a godly man shall understand, do and execute the things contained in the Common-Prayer-Book, according to the principles and pious intentions of our first Reformers, and of the main Body of godly Bishops and Episcopal Divines, since the time of King Edward the VI. to this day, no man may say he doth not keep to the Law and Standard. I do not think if you had gone in the late times to Bishop Hall and Bishop Wren, that they would have given the same Exposition of all things in the Book. And I have as true warrant from the Law to rest in the judgment and practice of *Cranmer, Ridley, Grindal, Abbot, Jewel, Hall*, as another may have to rest in the judgment and practice of *Bancroft, Laud, Wren*, and such like, if not more.

*Sect. 8.* Those words, *Receive the Holy Ghost*, are capable of an interpretation in a better and worse sense. I have reason to think the  
Compilers

Compilers of the Liturgy meant them in the better sense, and meant nothing false or ungodly. See that you be duly qualified by the Holy Ghost for the work of the Ministry. We have received authority from the Holy Ghost to ordain Ministers in his Church: by virtue whereof we ordain you. As much as lyes in us we make you true and compleat Ministers of the Holy Ghost. The Bishop hath power, if I doubt, to judge my Subscription in this sense sufficient and honest as to this.

*Sect. 9.* My answer to those words to the people, In the name of God come forth and make your exceptions to the party to be ordained, if you have any; and to your exception against the same; you say *requireth pity rather than reply*. Truly I took your exception to be only as to Presbyters Ordination. You seem by your silence to allow my answer as to that. But now I perceive you mean it of the Bishops Ordination too. The form it self you blame not. I assent and consent to the form it self. The form is godly. They may use it well and honestly if they will. When a Bishop is ordained or consecrated, he is ordained or consecrated to serve as a Bishop in the Church Universal. Notice may be given to neighbour Ministers and people, besides those of the Congregation where he is to be ordained. No person is barred from coming to the Ordination. Before a Bishop is ordained and placed in his See, the Magistrate issueth forth a Writ to the Dean and Chapter of the Cathedral, to chuse them a Bishop. So that without their election or consent, no Bishop is ordained and set in his place.

place. If you say this is but matter of form; you must prove it. *Stabitur presumptioni donec probetur in contrarium.* I am not to charge Equivocation and dishonest meaning upon legal proceedings without good proof. As for Diocesan, County, or half County Visitors, you direct the Magistrate to nominate and appoint these, without making any mention of the Votes of the people. Mr. Nye, an Independent, as you have cited him, grants the Magistrate may set teachers in all the Parishes throughout his dominions, and the people upon his Command are bound to hear them. By like reason he may set County Bishops and Diocesan Visitors, and Superintendents, throughout his dominions, and the people upon his Command are bound to hear and reverence them also. Put all my Answer together, and if it deserve pity rather than reply, I am well content to bear the censure.

Self. 9. As to *Athanasius's* Creed, methinks you should have nothing to object against it; who in your reformed Liturgy ordered it to be sometimes read and used.

Self. 10. Concerning the state of baptized Infants, and right to Sacraments, you tell me that I pass over the fundamental Controversie, as if I knew it not; which is, what Baptism and the Lords Supper are. This is it that we are mostly disagreed about. End this, and end all. *Answer.* When a grown person is baptized, he doth enter into Covenant with God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, to be his faithful servant all his days, against sin, the World and the Devil. It is as the Marriage Covenant between Husband



band and Wife. Infant Baptism is the obliging of Infants to God, or the solemn entring of them into this same Oath and Covenant by those who have interest and propriety in them, and authority so to do. The Lords Supper is the eating of Bread, and drinking of Wine, consecrated by a lawful Minister, in a solemn manner, by Saints or sanctified men, in remembrance of Christ crucified, and by virtue of his institution.

If one come to me and say, I will be a Christian, but will not be a godly man; I am willing to have Christ for my Saviour, but not the Holy Ghost for my Sanctifier; I would not baptize him. You shall covenant your Soul to be a godly man, to be a Christian indeed, or you shall have no Baptism from me. But if this same man shall understandingly, seriously, deliberately, and willingly offer himself to be baptized, and thereby covenant himself to be a sincere Christian and a godly man, I would baptize him; yea if I had a window into his heart, and could discern that for the present he is not sincere. If a Woman shall say, I consent to have this Man for my Husband, and to be his lawful Wife, but I will be Master, and lord over him, and be at my liberty to company with other men; this is no right Marriage engagement, it is a contradiction, and destructive to the being of Marriage Society: such a Contract makes no lawful Husband and Wife. But if she shall say, I consent to have him for my Husband, for better for worse, and to be his lawful Wife, till death us do part, though she say this with a false deceitful heart, she is nevertheless the Mans Wife both before God and man;

man: yea, if the man did before-hand know that her heart were more towards another, than to him, and that she would in covenanting pronounce the words with an unsincere heart; it was his choice to take her at her word, and make the best of her he could, in hopes in time by one good means or another to win her heart over to him. This is the Case between Christ and Souls. I will express my self in your own words, *in your Saints rest, part. 4. c. 4. f. 3. pag. 663, 664.* The door of the visible Church is incomparably wider than the door of Heaven; and Christ is so tender, so bountiful and forward to convey his Grace, and the Gospel is so free an offer and invitation to all, that surely Christ will keep no man off; if they will come but only to a visible profession, he will not deny them admittance there, because they intend to go no further; but will let them come as near as they will, and that they come no further shall be their own fault: and so it is not his readiness to admit such, nor the openness of the door of his visible Church, that makes men Hypocrites, but their own wickedness: Christ will not keep such out among Infidels, for fear of making Hypocrites; but when the Net is drawn unto the shore, the Fishes shall be separated; and when the time of Harvest comes, then the Angels shall gather out of his Church all things that offend, and them that work iniquity, *Mat. 13. 41.* There are many Saints (or sanctified men) [N. B.] that yet shall never come to Heaven, who are only Saints by their separation from Paganism, into fellowship with the visible Church, but not Saints  
in

in the strictest sense, by separation from the ungodly into the fellowship of the Mystical Body of Christ. So far you now will find that this is the case. No man will suspect Mr. *Durham* to be partial in this Cause. If you please to read him upon the third Commandment, the Book I have not now with me, but to my best remembrance you will find he doth there determine, speaking of Sacramental Vows, that upon the whole matter it is better and safer simply to vow and fail in performance, than neither to vow nor perform. It is a hard strait, a knot which no mortal man can untye, while the impenitent man doth by his impenitency keep it tied. But since he doth by his own unsincerity entangle himself in a necessity of sinning, it is better and safer for him to covenant his Soul to God, and be baptized, and come to the Lords Supper, and so be under Gods healing means, striving and doing what he can, than to remain a Pagan. If thou refuse to vow thy Soul to God, and enter into his Oath and Covenant, there is no hope of thee, thou art a dead man. But if thou shalt vow thy Soul to God, and keep under his means, and do thy best, there is hope. God may convert thee, thou canst but dye. *Solomon* says, *A living Dog is better than a dead Lion*: but he doth not say that a living Dog is better than a dead man. A Pagan is as a living Dog: A Christian not sincere is as a dead man. We will shew some more respect to a dead man than to a living Dog. It is to the visible Church consisting of bad and good, Hypocrites and sincere, *Unto whom* pertaineth the *adoption*, and the glory, and the Covenant, and the living

ing of the Law, and the service of God, and the promises, Rom: 9. 4. Not only promises conditional, but even promises absolute, of giving the full Grace and Regeneration. The Sacraments seal the whole Covenant on Gods part. Though God hath not promised to any one by name absolutely to convert him: yet he hath promised to do it for some. He hath not said he will not do it for thee, for me, for this or that particular person. The unregenerate may to the Lords Supper turn such promises into prayer, and plead with God upon them for converting Grace. The Sacraments are a seal of those promises in the general.

Not only sincere covenanting giveth right to the outward Ordinance *coram Deo*; but even bare covenanting, though the heart for the present be not sincere, giveth right to the outward Ordinance, not only *coram Ecclesia*, but *coram Deo*. The unsoundness of his heart makes him liable to damnation, and nothing he does is acceptable to God, so as the actions and duties of the regenerate are. But by reason of his outward covenanting with God, and joining himself to the Society of the faithful, he is nearer to Gods Grace and Conversion, than a Pagan. For as of old, salvation was of the Jews, so now salvation is of the Christians. We know but of few Pagans converted. They are said to be Aliens from the Commonwealth of Israel, strangers from the Covenants of promise, without God, and without Christ, and without hope in the world, Ephes: 2. 12. Outward covenanting makes a man a Christian before God, though for  
want

want of inward sincerity he is a Christian *cum ter-  
mino diminvente*, an unsound Christian, a branch in  
Christ bearing no fruit, *John* 15. 2. a Child of the  
Kingdom, who yet shall be cast out into utter  
darkness, if he repent not, *Matth.* 8. 12. And it  
is frequent in Scripture to call Hypocrites, false  
Professours, adulterous, Covenant-breaking and  
grossly scandalous Israelites, the people of God;  
and God ownes himself married to them as a pec-  
liar people above all people upon the face of the  
Earth, as mingled with the truly godly, *Judg.* 20.  
2. *Jer.* 2. 11, 12, 13. 2 *Sam.* 1. 12. *Hos.* 4. 6, 12.  
*Mic.* 6. 3. *Jer.* 3. 13, 14. *Exod.* 19. 6. *Deut.* 7. 6.  
and 14. 2, 21. and 26. 19. and 28. 9. *Isai.* 1. 3.

○ You grant it is intolerable rigour and severity  
openly and by name to excommunicate all such as  
*coram Ecclesia* remain perfidious and ungodly  
Christians. And yet your Doctrine doth no less.  
For in your Book of Confirmation, I have it not  
now with me, but in one of your propositions, you  
speak to this purpose, Such as have been baptized  
in infancy, and are now grown up, before we admit  
them to the state and priviledges of adult Church-  
members, we must enquire after their lives,  
which must be such as do not confute their pro-  
fession. By this principle all ministers must be  
bound to make diligent search and enquiry after  
the lives of all those that either desire Baptism  
for their Infants, or the Lords Supper for them-  
selves. If we do not make due and diligent  
search and enquiry, we shall be counted unfaith-  
ful. If we do, so many as to rational Charity  
do seem to be ungodly, unregenerate, wanting  
the spirit of Christ, if they have not the essen-

tials



tials of sincerity, if their lives confute their profession, we must ban all these from the Lords Supper, and their Infants from Baptism. Instead of Arguments for this your Principle I would desire to see it practised. Let it be practised but one year, but one half year by all the Ministers of *England*, both Conformists and Non-conformists, in its full breadth and compass, and I will desire no more for its confutation.

When you do juridically put these people from the Lords Supper, and their Infants from Baptism, what do you less than excommunicate them? In Excommunication are two things, Sentence and Execution. You do by publick Doctrine sentence them for dogs and swine, and you use them as excommunicate ones, you shut them and their Infants out of the Communion of the Faithful, and debar them from the Priviledges of Christian people.

And that you might make your rigorous Assertion square and consistent to it self, you run your self into another mischief, which is, to affirm, that either the Infants of ungodly Israelites under the Law *de facto* were not circumcised, or if they were, *de jure* they had no right to Circumcision; both which are plainly contradictory to the tenour of the Scriptures, and the Judgment of the Catholick Church. Insomuch that Dr. *Homes* himself in his mischief of mixt Communion, pag. 15, plainly confesses: We see evidently all along the Old Testament, that if men were but ceremonially cleansed, and not guilty of capital crimes, they were admitted to all Ordinances for the general. And Mr. *Cotton* in his way of the Churches of New-England,

pag. 19. confesses that all Jews, young and old, were admitted to the Passover, unless defiled with some pollution. And pag. 78. All that were circumcised among the Israelites might rightly keep the Passover amongst them.

Your Principle leans upon a false bottom, which is this, That no Indulgence or Church forbearance is to be shewn to Christians, whose lives confute their Profession: but forthwith they are to be debarred from Church-priviledges they and their Infants. Whereas we see all along how God bore with his own people, though their crimes and scandals were great, they and their Infants were admitted to Church-priviledges. He owned himself for their Husband, they were Hypocrites, and adulterous Covenant-breaking ones against him, he tryed all ways, and waited a long time for their return, till there was no remedy. But you turn multitudes of Christian Parents and their Infants out of the Church by rigorous Sentence and Execution, so soon as you can by diligent inquiry perceive that the Parents and persons grown up are not true to their Profession.

You and Mr. Hammer require no more for admission to the Lords Supper, but solemn Confirmation of such as have been baptized in Infancy when grown up. And yet you confess that such as come to Church, and joyn in Ordinances, and are admitted to the Lords Supper, are confirmed eminently, though not formally.

Saith Mr. Tho. Hooker in his Survey, part 3. c. 2. pag. 11. while wicked Members are tolerated fully in the Church, they and their children may partake

partake of the Priviledges. This is beyond question: nor do I know, nor yet ever heard it denied by any of ours. So be. How much more may wicked Members they and their Infants be admitted to the Priviledges, when they are innocently and lawfully tolerated? And Mr. Baxter himself confesses, that they cannot be excommunicated and cast out without endangering both Church and State, and setting multitudes of them the next step to Hell.

I have said it is clear, that Judas was at the Lords Supper: pardon that expression, it overslip me. The reverence I bear to you and many more which hold the contrary, will not suffer me to say it is clear. But of the two I think it more probable. I suppose all agree that he was at the Passover. This was an holy Ordinance of God as well as the Lords Supper. It was equally damnation then to receive the Passover unworthily, as it is now to receive the Lords Supper unworthily. Gods Law then was, *The sacrifice of the wicked is abomination to God. I will be sanctified of all them that draw nigh unto me. Then shalt not take the Name of the Lord thy God in vain.* Why did not Christ put Judas from the Passover? He know full well that his heart was unsound, and that he would in time betray him. There is no one reason can be urged for barring persons from either Baptism or the Lords Supper for want of internal Holiness and Regeneration, but it may as strongly be urged for barring Judas from the Passover. Jesus Christ had better knowledge of Judas's heart, than any Minister hath or can have of the heart of any unregenerate man in the world.

The question here is twofold : 1. What was the duty of *Judas*. 2. What was the duty of Christ. It was the duty of *Judas* first to repent, and then to receive. He sinned in breaking this order : so doth every unconverted man in all that he doth. His first work is to be a sincere Convert. If he delay a moment he sins, and the longer he delays the more hainous is his sin. But if *Judas* repent not, he is bound nevertheless to receive : and accordingly he doth receive. Christ blames him not for receiving. He doth not directly give him a Seal of Damnation; but he offers him the Passover, and therewith forgiveness and life eternal, in case he be sincere. Christ did not give him poyson to drink, but he put into his hands the sign and seal of Salvation to be his upon his sincere repentance. The poyson is in *Judas*'s heart, who doth wilfully and wickedly put from him the grace of God, and cleaveth to the World and the Devil rather than to Christ. If it had been Christs duty to have debarred him, he would. And from this instance it is evident, that we may admit to the Lords Supper known Hypocrites, whose lives confute their Professions, very *Judas*'s. Christ in this case did act as a Minister, and as the supreme Pattern of all Ministers; he did knowingly tolerate a wicked man at the Passover. He detested all his wickedness, yet did he not blame or condemn him for doing the outward act, and being with the rest of the Disciples, and joyning in external fellowship with them. The Sacrament is not poyson : it is a sweet savour of God as well in them that perish as in them that are saved. It is no uncharitableness to give the Lords  
body

body and blood to a known wicked man, by the example of Christ to *Judas*. I do not countenance him in his wickedness, I do not strengthen him in presumption, I do not tell him that he is a godly man, I do not defile Gods Ordinance. I make a due distinction between the precious and the vile. Muster up all the Arguments you can against mens coming to the Lords Table till inwardly regenerate, and admitting known Hypocrites and deceitful false-hearted *Judas*'s there to; they may all be refuted from this one instance of Christ admitting *Judas* to the Passover, and *Judas* being there as his duty and privilege. If any shall say that *Judas* as yet had committed no scandals, nor discovered any unsoundness before the World; prove what you say. But if that should be granted, it is not enough to the point. Christ knew him to be a Devil, to be unholy before God, who would shortly betray him, and his wickedness would burst forth to the notice of all, and his name be execrable to all Ages. Yet did he tolerate this wicked Wretch at the Passover, and suffered him to share with the rest of the Apostles in external Privileges.

And here comes in another Confutation of that your Opinion, That the unregenerate hath no right to Gods Ordinance before God; for Christ is God. And *Judas* had right to the Passover before him. Christ did not at all dispute or deny his right to the outward Ordinance.

According to your Doctrine Christ and *John* erred, when they baptized multitudes who had been circumcised in Infancy, without making inquiry after their lives. They put none from



their Baptism who came to their Sermons, and consented to their Doctrine, and were willing to be baptized, though it is evident from the Gospel, that many of those whom they baptized were Hypocrites, and such whose lives confuted their profession. They had right to Baptism before Christ himself who is God, *Joh. 4. 1. Joh. 3. 26.* They were under Covenant to God from their Infancy, and being grown up they were not found in Covenant; some are likened to the seed sown by the high way, some to seed sown among thorns, some to seed sown in stony places. Many were called, but few chosen. Some were Publicans and Harlots.

As touching Infants, you grant that such as have right to Baptism *coram Deo*, and are baptized, are in a state of Pardon, Adoption, and Salvation: which is enough to my cause, if you will but stick to your words.

The Liturgy doth not censure the state of Heathen Infants, but leaves them to God. And the Conference at Hampton Court certifies us, that they did not take those Infants of Christian Parents for lost, who by neglect of the Parent or Minister dyed without Baptism, much less those who could not possibly or with any conveniency be baptized. *Paul* says of himself, I was free-born, that is, of Pagan Rome: so the Child of a Christian is free-born: as of old there were Jews by nature, *Gal. 2. 14.* so now there are Christians by nature. The Infants of Christians are Christians so soon as they are born, though they are not actually baptized. They are Christians before Baptism in such sort as the King is King before

fore Crowning, or as the Jewish male Infants were Jews before the eighth day, and during all their sojourning in the Wilderness when Circumcision was not used. The words of Christ, *John 3:5*, literally taken ascribe as much necessity to the outward water as the words in the Liturgy do.

You say your great Objection is against the manner of baptizing by Godfathers sole Sponsor, in the Liturgy; and that I over-look the main difficulty, or say as good as nothing to it.

*Ans.* The Liturgy doth suppose the Parents to be Christians themselves; it is they who are charged with the care of baptizing their child, they are to give notice over night or in the morning to the Minister of the Baptism of their child, they are to procure Godfathers and a Godmother, not to do the Parents part, but the part of assistant Sureties so much as they can do in an ordinary way. The Parent, unless licted by sickness or other impediment, is to be present at the Christening of his child, as Parent and principal; he with the Sureties are to enter the child into Gods Oath and Covenant, and lay a lasting Vow upon it to be the Lords. They all do joyn in a bond for its Education, the Parent as Parent and principal, the Sureties as a help over and besides for so much as they can well and honestly promise and do, if they make conscience of their ways.

The Baptism of the Infant doth not depend upon the inward sincerity of the Parent. Infants stand by their own innocency through Jesus Christ, and the grace of the second Covenant.

Christ is so gracious and bountiful, and so willing and ready to receive all that come to him, and hath expressed such good-will to Infants, that he would have none debarred from his Baptism, who by Christened willing Parents, or Owners by themselves or any for them, are brought to his Baptism. He would have his Ministers to accept and embrace them, and pronounce that of such is the Kingdom of God: *ibi Lex non distinguit, nobis non distinguendum.*

As for that case of the Infidel Christian in your Parish, you say nothing of his Wife. It was sad if both were so. I would baptize that mans child, upon his willingness to have it baptized. It seems he was not such an Infidel, but he had some seeds of conviction in his mind. There were in Israel idolatrous Parents that burnt their children in the fire to *Molech*, Ezek. 16, 20, 21. It was no sin in them to circumcise their Infants to the true God. God owns them for his Infants in a Covenant sense.

You maintain the Infants of the godly to be in a state of pardon and adoption: so that dying in that condition they would certainly be saved. For they are blessed whose sin is forgiven, *Psal. 32. 1.* and whom God justifies he glorifies, *Rom. 8. 30.* Now it is evident from Scripture, and Reason, and Experience, and the Judgment of the Catholick Church, and the Doctrine of the Saints perseverance, that *Ishmael* and *Esau*, and multitudes of Infants of godly Parents do want seminal holiness and inward heart purity, and a Divine nature from the Holy Ghost. If all the Infants of the godly were internally regenerate,  
Mankind

Mankind would be a race of holy and regenerate ones. Grace would be by nature and hereditary, all the World would be saved. On the other hand, if the Infants of the godly be not in a state of pardon and Justification, so that dying in infancy they would be saved; then we make void the hope of all Infants, and can have no ground so much to believe the certain Salvation of any one Infant by name. Rather than believe the certain Salvation of none, I will believe the certain Salvation of all. If the Infants of the godly be not in a state of Salvation, then none are! and the Infants of the godly many of them are no more regenerate than the Infants of the ungodly. If the unregenerate Infants of the godly be in a state of Justification, then heart regeneration is not necessary to Infants Salvation. For a justified person hath right to Heaven: he lacketh nothing necessary to Salvation. Infants cannot regenerate themselves. Parents cannot regenerate them if they were all as holy as *Abraham* and *Paul*. If they could do it, they would do it for *Ismael* and *Eson* as well as for *Isaac* and *Jacob*; for all their Infants as well as some, and then all the World would be holy. God will not damn Infants or Parents for simple and flat impossibilities. And what more are the Infants of the ungodly than unregenerate? I firmly hold that Infants have original sin, but it is pardoned in Christ to the Infant World, and Baptism is a sign and seal thereof to the Infants of all both ungodly and godly Christian Parents: so that no man shall perish eternally but for his own sin. *blow I* and

The business of Infant baptism is not to Chri-  
sten

Step Parents and Sponsors, but to Christen their  
 Infants, and enter them into Gods Covenant.  
 The want of regeneration and inward sincerity  
 in the Parents and Sponsors is no bar to the childs  
 Baptism before God. They do seriously enter  
 their child into Gods Covenant. They are wil-  
 ling to have it Christened. It is serious covenant-  
 ing which makes man and wife both before God  
 and men, though their hearts be adulterous.  
 And it is serious covenanting with God which  
 makes us Gods covenanted servants, whether  
 our hearts be sincere or no. A man may be se-  
 rious and not sincere. *Judas* was serious when he  
 repented, and returned the money, and went and  
 hanged himself. Many a man is serious for his  
 soul upon his sick bed, and yet wanteth graciously  
 sincerity. The Liturgy binds us not to baptize  
 any against their will, nor to invade Parents pro-  
 priety: but to Christen the Infants of Christians,  
 who of themselves are willing, requiring them  
 to do their endeavour in getting Sponsors and  
 Sureties. But where none can be had, we must  
 Christen without. What other judgment can the  
 Bishop himself make of the case? It is plain they  
 would not have Infants unchristened, nor do they  
 strip Parents of their Propriety, nor do they forbid  
 the Parents from being present at the Baptism of  
 their child, and standing there as Parent. No  
 Law forbids him. There are few Parents but  
 upon the Ministers intimation and request they  
 will willingly be present. When the Parent  
 comes to give notice, the Minister may say to  
 him, I would have you to come with your own  
 child, and offer it to Baptism with the Godfa-

thers



there and Godmothers, unless you be sick or  
 reasonably hindered. As for that passage about  
 Bishop *Usher*, I know well he was dead before  
 this new Act for Uniformity took place. I meant  
 of a clause in the old Book, which I had thought  
 was the same with this, only transplac'd. You  
 say the former clause meant no more but that  
 the Infant had all things necessary *ex parte Ecclesie*.  
 But either this interpretation is too narrow, or  
 it grants the thing in question. For if the Infant  
 hath all things necessary *ex parte Ecclesie*, what  
 more can man do for it? You that think this  
 clause about Infants certainty of Salvation, dying  
 baptized before actual sin, to be an addition to  
 Gods Word, should beware of adding to Gods  
 Word your self, when you say that the Baptism  
 of the Infants of Hypocrites goeth no further for  
 the Infant than for the hypocritical Parent. For  
 nothing is more certain than that the Parent is  
 damned if he dye in his hypocrisie, notwithstanding  
 his Baptism; but that his Infant baptized dy-  
 ing in infancy for want of Parents sincerity, is as  
 certainly damned, is certainly an addition to  
 Gods Word. Of the two it is rather certain that  
 the Infant is saved, if the plain words of Christ  
 stand good, *Mat. 10*, *Abraham* says to the rich  
 man in Hell: They that be in Heaven cannot pass  
 to Hell if they would. So I may say of God by  
 way of impossible supposition; he cannot save  
 ungodly Parents in their ungodliness if he would.  
 If he will save them, he must convert and sanctifie  
 them. But though Parents be wicked and dam-  
 ned, it is free for God to save their Infants. They  
 may be elect'd by God, redeemed by Christ, san-  
 ctified

crified by the Holy Ghost. They have as much true heart-holiness and seminal purity as thousands of the Infants of the godly have. *Herod* slew all the male infants in *Bethlehem* and the coasts thereof from two years old and under. The Church of God hath used to account those slain Infants, holy Innocents, a kind of Martyrs, and to keep a Festivity in memorial of them. And who can say that all those slain Infants were the Infants of the godly only? In *Cyprian's* time some thought Infants might not be Christened till some days old from the parity of Circumcision. But *Cyprian* with his Collegues in Council withstood them, saying, *Nulli hominum nato deneganda est gratia Christi: omnis omnino homo admittendus est ad gratiam Christi.* It is in his Epistles. I have not the Book now with me.

*Sect. 11.* Concerning the Apocrypha I shall not contradict what our Protestant Divines alledge against those Writings. All that I maintain is this, That it is lawful in case of deprivation to read those places and Chapters which are prescribed by the Liturgy, as humane Writings sufficiently distinguished from the Divine, and to assent and consent so to do. The Bishop hath power to declare my subscription in this sufficient.

*Sect. 12.* Concerning the daily reading of Morning and Evening Prayer, if the Minister be letted by sickness, or other urgent cause, or be not at home, or be otherwise reasonably hindered, the Law frees him from reading. The Bishop hath power to determine what is an urgent cause, what is a reasonable hinderance. As for reading in private,

private, the Abridged Preface declare that it is an universal agreement in Gods publick Worship: which is aimed at. *NEW TESTAM. FOR 1659* *1660* *1661* *1662* *1663* *1664* *1665* *1666* *1667* *1668* *1669* *1670* *1671* *1672* *1673* *1674* *1675* *1676* *1677* *1678* *1679* *1680* *1681* *1682* *1683* *1684* *1685* *1686* *1687* *1688* *1689* *1690* *1691* *1692* *1693* *1694* *1695* *1696* *1697* *1698* *1699* *1700* *1701* *1702* *1703* *1704* *1705* *1706* *1707* *1708* *1709* *1710* *1711* *1712* *1713* *1714* *1715* *1716* *1717* *1718* *1719* *1720* *1721* *1722* *1723* *1724* *1725* *1726* *1727* *1728* *1729* *1730* *1731* *1732* *1733* *1734* *1735* *1736* *1737* *1738* *1739* *1740* *1741* *1742* *1743* *1744* *1745* *1746* *1747* *1748* *1749* *1750* *1751* *1752* *1753* *1754* *1755* *1756* *1757* *1758* *1759* *1760* *1761* *1762* *1763* *1764* *1765* *1766* *1767* *1768* *1769* *1770* *1771* *1772* *1773* *1774* *1775* *1776* *1777* *1778* *1779* *1780* *1781* *1782* *1783* *1784* *1785* *1786* *1787* *1788* *1789* *1790* *1791* *1792* *1793* *1794* *1795* *1796* *1797* *1798* *1799* *1800* *1801* *1802* *1803* *1804* *1805* *1806* *1807* *1808* *1809* *1810* *1811* *1812* *1813* *1814* *1815* *1816* *1817* *1818* *1819* *1820* *1821* *1822* *1823* *1824* *1825* *1826* *1827* *1828* *1829* *1830* *1831* *1832* *1833* *1834* *1835* *1836* *1837* *1838* *1839* *1840* *1841* *1842* *1843* *1844* *1845* *1846* *1847* *1848* *1849* *1850* *1851* *1852* *1853* *1854* *1855* *1856* *1857* *1858* *1859* *1860* *1861* *1862* *1863* *1864* *1865* *1866* *1867* *1868* *1869* *1870* *1871* *1872* *1873* *1874* *1875* *1876* *1877* *1878* *1879* *1880* *1881* *1882* *1883* *1884* *1885* *1886* *1887* *1888* *1889* *1890* *1891* *1892* *1893* *1894* *1895* *1896* *1897* *1898* *1899* *1900* *1901* *1902* *1903* *1904* *1905* *1906* *1907* *1908* *1909* *1910* *1911* *1912* *1913* *1914* *1915* *1916* *1917* *1918* *1919* *1920* *1921* *1922* *1923* *1924* *1925* *1926* *1927* *1928* *1929* *1930* *1931* *1932* *1933* *1934* *1935* *1936* *1937* *1938* *1939* *1940* *1941* *1942* *1943* *1944* *1945* *1946* *1947* *1948* *1949* *1950* *1951* *1952* *1953* *1954* *1955* *1956* *1957* *1958* *1959* *1960* *1961* *1962* *1963* *1964* *1965* *1966* *1967* *1968* *1969* *1970* *1971* *1972* *1973* *1974* *1975* *1976* *1977* *1978* *1979* *1980* *1981* *1982* *1983* *1984* *1985* *1986* *1987* *1988* *1989* *1990* *1991* *1992* *1993* *1994* *1995* *1996* *1997* *1998* *1999* *2000* *2001* *2002* *2003* *2004* *2005* *2006* *2007* *2008* *2009* *2010* *2011* *2012* *2013* *2014* *2015* *2016* *2017* *2018* *2019* *2020* *2021* *2022* *2023* *2024* *2025* *2026* *2027* *2028* *2029* *2030* *2031* *2032* *2033* *2034* *2035* *2036* *2037* *2038* *2039* *2040* *2041* *2042* *2043* *2044* *2045* *2046* *2047* *2048* *2049* *2050* *2051* *2052* *2053* *2054* *2055* *2056* *2057* *2058* *2059* *2060* *2061* *2062* *2063* *2064* *2065* *2066* *2067* *2068* *2069* *2070* *2071* *2072* *2073* *2074* *2075* *2076* *2077* *2078* *2079* *2080* *2081* *2082* *2083* *2084* *2085* *2086* *2087* *2088* *2089* *2090* *2091* *2092* *2093* *2094* *2095* *2096* *2097* *2098* *2099* *2100* *2101* *2102* *2103* *2104* *2105* *2106* *2107* *2108* *2109* *2110* *2111* *2112* *2113* *2114* *2115* *2116* *2117* *2118* *2119* *2120* *2121* *2122* *2123* *2124* *2125* *2126* *2127* *2128* *2129* *2130* *2131* *2132* *2133* *2134* *2135* *2136* *2137* *2138* *2139* *2140* *2141* *2142* *2143* *2144* *2145* *2146* *2147* *2148* *2149* *2150* *2151* *2152* *2153* *2154* *2155* *2156* *2157* *2158* *2159* *2160* *2161* *2162* *2163* *2164* *2165* *2166* *2167* *2168* *2169* *2170* *2171* *2172* *2173* *2174* *2175* *2176* *2177* *2178* *2179* *2180* *2181* *2182* *2183* *2184* *2185* *2186* *2187* *2188* *2189* *2190* *2191* *2192* *2193* *2194* *2195* *2196* *2197* *2198* *2199* *2200* *2201* *2202* *2203* *2204* *2205* *2206* *2207* *2208* *2209* *2210* *2211* *2212* *2213* *2214* *2215* *2216* *2217* *2218* *2219* *2220* *2221* *2222* *2223* *2224* *2225* *2226* *2227* *2228* *2229* *2230* *2231* *2232* *2233* *2234* *2235* *2236* *2237* *2238* *2239* *2240* *2241* *2242* *2243* *2244* *2245* *2246* *2247* *2248* *2249* *2250* *2251* *2252* *2253* *2254* *2255* *2256* *2257* *2258* *2259* *2260* *2261* *2262* *2263* *2264* *2265* *2266* *2267* *2268* *2269* *2270* *2271* *2272* *2273* *2274* *2275* *2276* *2277* *2278* *2279* *2280* *2281* *2282* *2283* *2284* *2285* *2286* *2287* *2288* *2289* *2290* *2291* *2292* *2293* *2294* *2295* *2296* *2297* *2298* *2299* *2300* *2301* *2302* *2303* *2304* *2305* *2306* *2307* *2308* *2309* *2310* *2311* *2312* *2313* *2314* *2315* *2316* *2317* *2318* *2319* *2320* *2321* *2322* *2323* *2324* *2325* *2326* *2327* *2328* *2329* *2330* *2331* *2332* *2333* *2334* *2335* *2336* *2337* *2338* *2339* *2340* *2341* *2342* *2343* *2344* *2345* *2346* *2347* *2348* *2349* *2350* *2351* *2352* *2353* *2354* *2355* *2356* *2357* *2358* *2359* *2360* *2361* *2362* *2363* *2364* *2365* *2366* *2367* *2368* *2369* *2370* *2371* *2372* *2373* *2374* *2375* *2376* *2377* *2378* *2379* *2380* *2381* *2382* *2383* *2384* *2385* *2386* *2387* *2388* *2389* *2390* *2391* *2392* *2393* *2394* *2395* *2396* *2397* *2398* *2399* *2400* *2401* *2402* *2403* *2404* *2405* *2406* *2407* *2408* *2409* *2410* *2411* *2412* *2413* *2414* *2415* *2416* *2417* *2418* *2419* *2420* *2421* *2422* *2423* *2424* *2425* *2426* *2427* *2428* *2429* *2430* *2431* *2432* *2433* *2434* *2435* *2436* *2437* *2438* *2439* *2440* *2441* *2442* *2443* *2444* *2445* *2446* *2447* *2448* *2449* *2450* *2451* *2452* *2453* *2454* *2455* *2456* *2457* *2458* *2459* *2460* *2461* *2462* *2463* *2464* *2465* *2466* *2467* *2468* *2469* *2470* *2471* *2472* *2473* *2474* *2475* *2476* *2477* *2478* *2479* *2480* *2481* *2482* *2483* *2484* *2485* *2486* *2487* *2488* *2489* *2490* *2491* *2492* *2493* *2494* *2495* *2496* *2497* *2498* *2499* *2500* *2501* *2502* *2503* *2504* *2505* *2506* *2507* *2508* *2509* *2510* *2511* *2512* *2513* *2514* *2515* *2516* *2517* *2518* *2519* *2520* *2521* *2522* *2523* *2524* *2525* *2526* *2527* *2528* *2529* *2530* *2531* *2532* *2533* *2534* *2535* *2536* *2537* *2538* *2539* *2540* *2541* *2542* *2543* *2544* *2545* *2546* *2547* *2548* *2549* *2550* *2551* *2552* *2553* *2554* *2555* *2556* *2557* *2558* *2559* *2560* *2561* *2562* *2563* *2564* *2565* *2566* *2567* *2568* *2569* *2570* *2571* *2572* *2573* *2574* *2575* *2576* *2577* *2578* *2579* *2580* *2581* *2582* *2583* *2584* *2585* *2586* *2587* *2588* *2589* *2590* *2591* *2592* *2593* *2594* *2595* *2596* *2597* *2598* *2599* *2600* *2601* *2602* *2603* *2604* *2605* *2606* *2607* *2608* *2609* *2610* *2611* *2612* *2613* *2614* *2615* *2616* *2617* *2618* *2619* *2620* *2621* *2622* *2623* *2624* *2625* *2626* *2627* *2628* *2629* *2630* *2631* *2632* *2633* *2634* *2635* *2636* *2637* *2638* *2639* *2640* *2641* *2642* *2643* *2644* *2645* *2646* *2647* *2648* *2649* *2650* *2651* *2652* *2653* *2654* *2655* *2656* *2657* *2658* *2659* *2660* *2661* *2662* *2663* *2664* *2665* *2666* *2667* *2668* *2669* *2670* *2671* *2672* *2673* *2674* *2675* *2676* *2677* *2678* *2679* *2680* *2681* *2682* *2683* *2684* *2685* *2686* *2687* *2688* *2689* *2690* *2691* *2692* *2693* *2694* *2695* *2696* *2697* *2698* *2699* *2700* *2701* *2702* *2703* *2704* *2705* *2706* *2707* *2708* *2709* *2710* *2711* *2712* *2713* *2714* *2715* *2716* *2717* *2718* *2719* *2720* *2721* *2722* *2723* *2724* *2725* *2726* *2727* *2728* *2729* *2730* *2731* *2732* *2733* *2734* *2735* *2736* *2737* *2738* *2739* *2740* *2741* *2742* *2743* *2744* *2745* *2746* *2747* *2748* *2749* *2750* *2751* *2752* *2753* *2754* *2755* *2756* *2757* *2758* *2759* *2760* *2761* *2762* *2763* *2764* *2765* *2766* *2767* *2768* *2769* *2770* *2771* *2772* *2773* *2774* *2775* *2776* *2777* *2778* *2779* *2780* *2781* *2782* *2783* *2784* *2785* *2786* *2787* *2788* *2789* *2790* *2791* *2792* *2793* *2794* *2795* *2796* *2797* *2798* *2799* *2800* *2801* *2802* *2803* *2804* *2805* *2806* *2807* *2808* *2809* *2810* *2811* *2812* *2813* *2814* *2815* *2816* *2817* *2818* *2819* *2820* *2821* *2822* *2823* *2824* *2825* *2826* *2827* *2828* *2829* *2830* *2831* *2832* *2833* *2834* *2835* *2836* *2837* *2838* *2839* *2840* *2841* *2842* *2843* *2844* *2845* *2846* *2847* *2848* *2849* *2850* *2851* *2852* *2853* *2854* *2855* *2856* *2857* *2858* *2859* *2860* *2861* *2862* *2863* *2864* *2865* *2866* *2867* *2868* *2869* *2870* *2871* *2872* *2873* *2874* *2875* *2876* *2877* *2878* *2879* *2880* *2881* *2882* *2883* *2884* *2885* *2886* *2887*

session of godliness, and are bound to believe their profession, as *Simon Magus* and others. I think there are not many within our Towns and Parishes, not sententially excommunicate, who bury with us, but we may have as good hope of them as by your Doctrine we are bound to have of many baptized by the Apostles and their successors. What more is necessary for satisfaction in this point, the Bishop hath power from time to time to order and resolve.

*Self. 14.* Concerning Confirmation, the Bishop hath power to determine whether those must be confirmed who already have been admitted to the Communion.

As to the thing it self, when you write for Confirmation, then the Common Prayer Book serves your turn, and falls in with your sense; but when you come to write against Consonantity, then Confirmation according to the Common Prayer Book is another thing. You say in your Book of Confirmation, that that which you plead for, suits with the principles of all that fear God. And sure the Compilers of the Liturgy, and multitudes of Bishops and conformable Divines have been men fearing God; and therefore your and their sense of Confirmation cannot much differ.

I have read somewhere to my remembrance that in the late Kings time there was a Treaty at *Uxbridge* between the Bishops and the Presbyterian Divines; and it was yielded to by the Bishops that Confirmation should be left to the Parishes Ministers.

Bishop *Hall* hath written a small Tract upon this point of Confirmation in a sound and moderate

rate

rite itself, affirming it to be the sense of the Liturgy, and prailing the Church of England therein as more reformed than the way taken by the Presbyterians and Covenanters in the late Times; I am still of opinion, that whether Confirmation be done by the Bishop or no, if the Parish Minister be a man of wisdom and fidelity, he may substantially edify his Flock.

That none be admitted to the Sacrament till duly confirmed; or desirous thereof, you grant to be a reasonable and profitable Order: 'Tis then to be hoped, that the main body of godly people being mildly dealt with, and the reasons of this practice being laid open to them, will at least desire it rather than be put from the Sacrament.

If all Bishops were but as Dr. *Whe* and Dr. *Hall*, the people would highly esteem them, and would take it for a mercy to have the solemn Prayers and Blessing of such, and a reasonable duty solemnly to owe and stand to their baptismal Vow.

I that am Pastor of the place can best tell the state of my Flock. *Satis populi est in prima Linea.* I will consult the peoples good and the common interest of the Church; I will neither elude the Law nor condemn it, the Bishop and his Suffragan shall have their Right reserved to them in the matter of Confirmation, the people shall be mildly and faithfully dealt with, I will do no rigour to them, nor be any snare to them. If I meet with a difficulty, I will lay by all worldly respects and carnal motives, and set my self as a dying man, and put my self into the case of *Cruc.*



met, Ridley, Hooper, Grindal, Usher, Hall, Carleton, and what no upright man may reasonably conceive they would do, and advise to, were they living and in my circumstances, that will I do. This is a doubt which pertains to the Bishop to resolve and regulate.

Self. 13. Concerning the Cross, you say it's strange to you, that I can discern no more difference between 1. private and publick Church actions, and 2. between a bare professing sign in *genere*, and a Sacramental covenanting dedicating symbolical sign in *specie*. *Ans.* To the first I answer, I can very well put a difference between private and publick Church actions. Baptism is a Church action. When it is done in a corner before a few, it is private Baptism: when it is done openly before all the Congregation in the usual place of meeting on the Lords day, it is publick Baptism. My Lord Chancellor is a publick Judge: but if he shall sentence a Cause privately in his Chamber before a few select persons it is a private Sentence done by one that is a publick Judge. If a private Christian shall make an open confession of his sins before all the Congregation, it is a publick Church action, though himself be a private Christian. By this distinction you seem to grant that the Cross may be used in private Church actions but not in publick Church actions: I prove to you, that Baptism privately done is a private Church action. By your own concession then the Cross may be used in private Baptism. If it may be used in private Baptism, you will never be able to prove it simply unlawful in publick Baptism.

2. To your second I answer, that your concession quite overthrows your Cause, and the Cross will stand if your concession hold. You grant it lawful to use it as a professing sign *in genere*. But give me leave to tell you, that Dr. Ames, Mr. Bradshaw, and the old Pleaders against the Cross, are against it as a professing sign of Religion *in genere*. I deny not but they may be against it chiefly in Baptism: but they are not against it solely in Baptism. These are Dr. Ames's words in his *Triplication*, pag. 211. *I would be resolved of this doubt: whether this be not a Doctrine religious in England: the sign of the Cross doth signify unto us that we should not be ashamed of Christ crucified, &c. If it be (as no Conformist can deny) then I would know, whether and where Christ our only authentick Teacher doth teach this Doctrine?* Here you see he is against the Cross as a professing sign of Religion *in genere*, as well out of Baptism as in Baptism. I use the Cross no otherwise than as a professing sign *in genere* equivalent to words. Both before the Law, under the Law, and since the Law, to the Worlds end, it is lawful to use decent and apt signs for the notifying of our minds one to another. Words are the most ordinary, but not the sole and only way of signifying our minds. A man may make a character to stand for what he pleases. *Que conveniunt in uno tertio conveniunt inter se*. I give you to understand by this Cross as by so many words, that I am not, nor ever will be ashamed of Christ crucified, of Baptism, of Preaching, of Prayer, of Christs Religion, of every branch thereof: it is applicable to the whole and every part. And so concerning

ing this Infant now baptized, I give you to understand by this Cross as by so many words, that it shall never be ashamed of Christ crucified, &c.

You say in your Ecclesiastical Cases, quest. 113. *It is lawful (seasonably and in fit circumstances) to use Images* 1. for memory, 2. for clearer apprehension, 3. for more passionate affection in religious cases. And that a Crucifix well befiteth the imagination and mind of a Believer.

You have said enough to justify the English use of the Cross, whether in Baptism or out of Baptism. I do not chiefly rely upon your concessions. I am ready to prove all that you grant, and I have opened those grounds and reasons which to an intelligent mind do amount to what you say, or lead him by just ratiocination to infer the same. But I do the more insist upon your concessions, because I think if any can overthrow the Cross you can. And I dare be bold to say, you can never by all that you can say, overthrow the use of the Cross in Baptism, as a naked Rite, sign, or token not to be ashamed of Christ, &c. while you stand to your own concessions. And if you do not, you will but double the difficulty, and have a harder task of it. Pardon this from one so much below you. But truth is truth, and will shine by its own light, and be its own defence.

The Church of England, with all sound Protestants, disowns the Doctrine of Sacraments working physically. *Non rati auxilio nec defensoribus istis Tempus eget.*

I do not under-estimate the Ceremony or Water-part in Baptism. But when Paul saith, Christ

sent

sent me not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel, I cannot but think he postpones Baptism to Preaching. And if it be not unlawful for a Minister in preaching to sign himself with the Cross, hereby I signifie to you, that I am not, nor ever will be ashamed of Christ, Preaching, Prayer, &c. It is not unlawful, after he hath done Baptism, to say, I am not, nor ever will be ashamed of what I have done, nor of Christ crucified, and for a token thereof I sign my self with the sign of the Cross. And as he may do thus to himself, so may he do to the Infant. Holy covenanting with God and faithful performance is the sum of all Religion. In token whereof I sign my self with the sign of the Cross to be faithful to Gods true Religion to my lifes end. Whether done in Baptism or out, the thing is the same, unlawful in neither.

*Ser.* 16. Concerning the lesser Excommunication and Church-discipline these are your words to me. — "You tell us a strange thing, which were it true, would half reconcile me to the English sort of Prelacy, viz. [that the lesser Excommunication out of a particular Congregation, seems to be allowed to all the Parish-Ministers] Say you so! what a sleep have I been in these fifty years, (since I have been ordained it's forty one years) that never could hear or read of any such thing?"

*Answ.* What if you have been in an error for these fifty years about the difference between the Church Universal and particular, making them to differ essentially? You affirm the Church Universal to be the Universality of baptized vi-

sible Christians beheaded by Christ alone, and particular Churches to beheaded by their respective Pastors. Now it is evident, that according to your sense of the Church Universal and particular, when Baptism was first set up, the universal and particular Church as consisting of baptized ones after Christ's Ascension made but one Congregation. He that was cut off from that one, and cast out of that one, was cut off from and cast out of the whole company of baptized ones. And now that the Church is increased, it is yet but one Society of Christian Pastors and people dwelling up and down the face of the Earth. And it is no absurdity to say the whole or the universal Church of God in *England*, and so the whole or the universal Church of God at *Corinth*, 1 *Cor.* 14. 23. and so at *Kedermister*, or any other place where there is a company of Christians, Pastor and people. And I do not see but that if you cast a man out of any one Church, you cast him out of all: that is, if you strip him of those Privileges which belong to a Christian man, and number him with those that are without, and for his crimes juridically exclude him from the Society and Communion of the Faithful: for the body is but one. *And without are dogs.*

You seem to grant, if I understand you right, that the Liturgy allows to the Parish Minister the power of juridical Suspension. If you deny it, the words of the Liturgy will convict you, they are plain, I appeal to them, and most Writers that I meet with against mixt Communions do so take them. But you say that this Suspension is not the *minor* Excommunication. That remains for

you



you to prove. There are some who, as the Author of a late Pamphlet, called *English Presbytery*, pag. 10. declares, do call it the lesser Excommunication. And if it be not a degree of Excommunication, and the lesser Excommunication, what is? If it be, you stand bound by your own words to be half reconciled to the English sort of Prelacy. Mr. *Craddock* in his *Glad Tydings from Heaven*, sets down what are the worst and harshest things in the Gospel; Reproof, and Excommunication, or cutting a man off from the people of God, or delivering up to Satan, both these are good news even to the worst of sinners; Reproof, and that upon great occasion; delivering to Satan, and that upon extraordinary occasion, pag. 31, 33, 34.

Here is no talk of Suspension. Christs words, *Mat. 18.* require a first and second admonition privately, if those will not do, then tell the Church: if he will not hear them, then let him be to thee as an Heathen man. I do not perceive that this doth warrant juridical Suspension as distinct from Excommunication. Bare admonition twenty times is not the suspension of a man from the Sacrament. *A man that is an heretick, after the first and second admonition reject.* He doth not say first admonish him, if he reform not suspend him, if he reform not excommunicate him. The incestuous Corinthian was not first juridically suspended, and afterwards excommunicated.

Such whose crimes and Heresies merit cutting off, and it would be sin in the Guides of the Church not to cut them off, let those be cut off and put from Church-priviledges. But if Mr.

Thomas Hooker say true, that while wicked Members are sinfully tolerated, there is no question but they may be admitted to the Priviledges, then there is no question but they may be admitted, when innocently tolerated, and they cannot be cut off without endangering Church and State, evacuating the force of Excommunication, and setting poor Souls the very next step to Hell.

For my own part, if my Principle were as sometime it was, that the unregenerate are not to come to the Lords Table, yet when I come to practise and apply this Principle, I dare not censure at that rate that I see many strict Ministers and people do. There are many whose state I do fear, and am in doubt of, but judge them children of the Devil and heirs of Hell, I dare not. If I were sworn of a Jury to judge a man for his life, I ought not to condemn him but upon good and clear Evidence. The Communion of Christs body and blood should be dearer to me than my life. And if the Sacrament be childrens bread, and I do juridically bar a man from it, I do not see but that hereby I put him without, as if I should say to him, This is childrens bread, you have no right to it. And according to your Principle I must be bound to put from Baptism the Infants of all those Parents whom I am to put from the Sacrament, which is a rigour and severity unto which I can neither reconcile my judgment nor affection. Even Mr. Sanders himself in his *Antididache*, pag. 128. allows Baptism to the child of any Member (how offensive soever) before the Sentence of cutting off

off pass upon him. And so is the Judgment and Practice of all the Churches throughout Christendom for ought I know. Indeed some years ago some *New-England* Brethren would not baptize the Infants of Non-confederates, as Mr. *T. Hooker* calls them. I was informed they would not baptize the Infants of such whose lives did confute their profession. But therein I was mistold; it was the Infants of such as would not confederate with them in their Church-way: but that rigour is now laid by. So that I know no one Party among us who are for Infant baptism, but their practice allows the baptizing of all, that is, of all that are called Christians, and do make a general profession of Christianity, such, Mr. *Bell* Catechism and Exposition upon it say, have right to Baptism for their Infants.

And I do not see how you can with uprightness and sincerity to your own Principle admit those Infants to Baptism whose Parents you think not admittable to the Lords Table. For if the child hath no right but by the parent, then a suspension of the parents right suspends the childs right born under the suspension, and the cutting off of the parent doth includedly and by course of Law cut off the child too. And if either I must bar such Infants from Baptism, or admit their Parents also to the Lords Supper, I am determined to admit the Parents to the Lords Supper: no man shall get me off this; not because I have no reasons for it; but because I have insuperable reasons from Scripture, from the Principles of Religion, Justice, and Charity, from Experience, and from the unanimous concordant judgment

and practice of the main Body of faithful Ministers and people from *Abrahams* time to this day.

We plainly see that Discipline, both Ecclesiastical and Civil, doth vary with persons, though the Rule of Discipline remains the same. Archbishop *Grindal* thought it no breach of Conformity to set up a sort of Exercises called Prophecings throughout all *England*. But his Successors *Bancroft* and *Land* were of another judgment and temper: yet they had all of them alike the Bible, with the Liturgy, Articles, and Homilies to be their Guide and Rule.

The High Priests office in *Judaea* was Divine, the Law and Testimony was their rule, but every High Priest was not for Wisdom and Faithfulness as *Aaron*, a *Jebojada*, an *Ezra*. Saith *Nehemiah*, the former Governors oppressed the people, but so did not I because of the fear of God, *Neh. 5. 15*. The former Governors were appointed to the same office with *Nehemiah*, but they were not faithful as *Nehemiah*. You know how in the late Times the greater part of the Judges of *England* perverted the Law, and gave wrong Judgment in the Case of Ship-money. Their office and the rule they were to act by was the same as it was to Judge *Crook* and the other Judges which concurred with him. If Mr. *Joseph Allein's* Cause had been tryed and sentenced before my Lord Chief Justice *Hales*, I believe that wise and faithful Judge would have acquitted him, and expounded the Law otherwise than it was expounded against him. There was not many years ago a Case in print of a Church-warden excommunicated

cated for refusing to take the Oath of a Church-warden. Upon complaint to the secular Court he had relief, and it was adjudged that the Ecclesiastical Court had no authority by the Law to impose the Oath of a Church-warden.

If men will be rigid and violent, there are many things in the Liturgy which may serve them for an occasion to exercise their violence. But if men will be humble, moderate and candid, and Bishops, and their Chancellours, and the Parish-Ministers, honestly do their duty according to the sense of the Liturgy candidly meant, as Bishop Reynolds in his Sermon before the House of Lords, as I take it, upon a Text in *Phil. 4.* concerning moderation, expresses it, *Salva Fide & Charitate, salvo inter Fratres pax & concordia vinculo.* I say if all sides would but be moderate, and practise due moderation, as Christians and Protestants, one months practice, or one years practice would let the World see that there is godly and substantial Discipline in the Parish-Churches and Dioceses of England; and that Mr. Dod was not mistaken when he said, That God under the Episcopal Government had given a marvellous encrease to the Gospel, and that godly men might comfortably comport therewith, under which Learning and Religion had so manifest an improvement. *Fullers Church History, Book. 11. Pag. 119.*

Shall such men as Dr. Heylin be the standard of the Doctrin and Discipline of the Church of England? a man that is not ashamed publicly to say, It was a mercy to Gods Church, that King Edward VI. whom all faithful Protestants lament to this day,



day, was cut off so young! O unhallowed tongue! if thy pains in History were no truer than this, they were fitter to be burnt by the common Hang-man, than openly sold and approved.

You almost laugh at my simplicity, because of a passage concerning putting the Bishop from the Sacrament, in case of persistence in a scandalous crime. But though I will not justify any either erroneous or imprudent word or matter, which shall be shewed me in my Book, yet I would in seriousness humbly tender to your thoughts a Case or two for animadversion.

*Saltmarsh* the Antinomian is Bishop of *Kedermunster*, and Mr. *Baxter* is a Presbyter thereof, *Saltmarsh* doth openly preach his anti-fundamental Antinomian principles, as that Christ hath repented and obeyed for us, and so we need not repent and obey the Gospel. What would you do in this case, suppose he should continue obstinate and contumacious in his sin? or suppose he should commit some great and heinous sin, and continue in it after just admonition? Or suppose in *Queen Maries* time you had been Pastor of that same Parish-Church where *Bowyer* Bishop of *London* used to reside, and he should be your frequent hearer, and Conscience binds you to abide upon the place? Or suppose your own reformed Liturgy established, which orders discipline to your content against scandalous and contumacious Sinners, and *King David* were now living, and his Seat or Palace should be within your Parish, and he should ordinarily resort to your Church for the Communion, and it should

be

be known to you and the Congregation that he had done those great evils in the matter of *Uriah*; what would you do in this case? I think if I had been in *John Baptist's* case, it had been my duty to have reproved *Herod*; but I cannot promise that I should have had his courage, and been as plain with *Herod* as he was.

The Blessed Virgin being espoused to *Joseph*, before they came together she was found with child of the Holy Ghost. *Joseph* her Husband being a just man, and not willing to make her a publick example, was minded to put her away privily, *Mat. 1. 18, 19.* Had some zealous men for discipline been of *Joseph's* Council, perhaps they would have advised to the open shaming of her, and bringing the matter into publick Audience, for the greater disgrace of sin. There is a time when the prudent are to be silent. My Judgment is, That a great part of godly Discipline doth consist in a just forbearance of it, when it cannot safely be done, and in sighing and mourning for many evils and scandals which neither Bishops nor Presbyters know how to remedy. And this seems to have been the case of our first Reformers in composing the Liturgy, who confess that there was a godly discipline in the ancient Churches, till the restoring whereof which they desire, they prescribe certain Curses and Comminations to be said yearly.

Why did they not establish that wished for Discipline? was it out of baseness and unfaithfulness? No: but they forbore to establish it out of pious discretion. They went as far as they could, the times then would bear no more, Why do not

not the Helvetian Churches set up Discipline? It is confessed that their principles as to admission to the Sacrament are lax, and their practice more lax? They have had as holy and learned and faithful Divines as other Reformed Churches have had. *Aretius* in his *Problem. de Excommunicatione* states the Question, if at this day Discipline may be restored? And to my remembrance he determines that for the present it cannot; it is not impossible but that it may be restored, but it is very hardly restorable, and not to be hoped for till better times. Sundry attempts had been made, but they saw it best to desist. *Satius* (saith he) *est habere amplas Ecclesias utut contaminatas quam nullas. Ex amplis non statim fiunt nulla: sed ex parvis nulla mox fiunt.*

When in the late times the Common Prayer Book and Prelacy were taken down, and multitudes lay under most deep and solemn obligations to reform and set up Christs Discipline in the Church, why was not Christs Discipline according to *Math. 18. 15, 16, 17, 18.* set up and practised by those who had by zealous praying, disputing and solemn swearing and covenanting obliged themselves to set it up? You your self in your Book of Confirmation plainly say, and more than say, as I have elsewhere shewed, That it cannot be set up and practised upon all in the Parishes of *England*, without ruining the souls of multitudes of our people, and endangering the Church and State, and Discipline also. Which is to come back to the Common-Prayer-Book, and the way of our first Reformers, and

confess

confess the Covenanters and Contenders for Discipline to have erred, and to have wronged our first Reformers, the Church, the State, and mens Souls. Who hath in a few words said more for the discipline of Christ than you, when you say those Ministers are Traitors to Christ under the name of Pastors, they betray the Church to licentiousness, and set up a new Church way, who shall wilfully cast out his Ministerial Kingly Government, that is, the discipline of Christ set down *Matth. 18. 15, 16, 17, 18.*? And yet, as with the same breath, and in the same place of your Book of Confirmation, you zealously maintain, That Christs Discipline cannot be set up and executed in the Parishes of *England* without the forementioned evils. And you say you had not known so much, if you had not tryed and proved it by experience; and you caution us not to trust the bold disputes of those confident men for discipline, who have not experienced and made tryal of what they contend for. If you had your will, all must be ejected for negligent Pastors, that shall not rule their Flock by Christs Discipline. And yet you say, Christs discipline cannot be practised upon all in our Churches, nor is it to be practised, How can these things consist, and how could you escape silencing by your own censure? You pretend to reform the Church in such a way as suiteth with the principles of all that fear God. And what is your way? It is this, *Either we must have no Churches at all, (that were sad) or we must have Churches without Christs discipline, or else we must take another way than the Bishops and our first Reformers did.*

*did.* You are plainly against the setting up and execution of Christs discipline upon all in the Parish-Churches in *England*, according to the Scripture-Rule. I doubt not but all faithful Protestants are against any other way. You honour the Bishops way exceedingly in putting it and the Scripture-way down together. Neither of these will fit your turn. Well, what is your better way? *As touching such as have been baptized in Infancy, and are grown up before we admit them to the state of adult-Church-members, or to the privileges of such, we must enquire after their lives, which must be such as do not confute their profession.* That is, rather than tolerate Hypocrites and such scandalous livers in the Church, as we may in no wise cast out and cut off, we must by rigid Doctrine and Execution debarre multitudes of Christian Infants from baptism, and Christian Parents and others from the Lords Supper, otherwise than according to the rule of Christ, *Matth. 18.* We must pluck up the Wheat with the Tares, we must bind Ministers to more than God hath bound them, we must by over-witty distinctions make a middle between Christians and no Christians, persons within and persons without, or rather paganize the greatest part, I fear, of the Christian world; and all this as Gods way, and by his warrant, and as the only way of Church-purity and Reformation in *England*. I tell you the Bishops way is plainly better than yours. And against all your Arguments against the Discipline of the Church of *England*, I level this one, There have been thousands of learned, holy, conscientious Episcopal Divines since Kings *Edward's* time,



time, who have disciplined themselves, their Families and their Flocks holily and exemplarily before God and the world, thousands of souls have been converted, confirmed and comforted by them, and God from Heaven hath given testimony to their Doctrine, Calling, Discipline, Worship, Administration and Conversation; and for ought I know you your self may have received the greatest mercy that ever God did vouchsafe you, or any man can have in this world, and that is, Regeneration in some one of the Churches of *England*, modelled according to the Bishops way.

*Selt.* 17. My reasonings that the Act for Uniformity is no part of the Book, you say, *You begin to be weary answering.* I appeal to your self, if you do not grant my Argument, and confound your self. For you grant it is absurd to say, That the thing to which the Appendix is annexed is a part of the Appendix. Now it is evident from the words and tenour of the Act, that the Act is the thing unto which the Book is annexed, and therefore can be no part of the Book. As suppose your Book, called, *The Saints everlasting Rest*; and the Magistrate should make a Law, That all that will not consent to all and every thing contained in the Book called *The Saints everlasting Rest*, annexed to this Act, and read an hour in it each Lords Day in publick, shall be no Minister; or being Minister, shall be ejected and banished: do you take this adventitious, extrinick, rigorous Law to be a part of your Book, and do you in subscribing to every thing in your own Book, subscribe to this severe Law and its penalties?

Ano-

Another of my reasons you say is worse than non-sense, and you tax me of unadvised confidence for insisting on it. But how do you convince me? Why, you say, The new Act not only confirmeth the old, but also altereth the sense of it, and tells me that henceforth it shall be understood, as meaning this Book. And that Bishop *Taylor* truly tells me, Laws are not the Laws of the dead, but of the living, who therefore give them what sense they please. *Answ.* Which is to say, That when the words of Assent and Consent to all and every thing, &c. do seem to make against Conformists, then Conformists equivocate and use stretches in going from them. But when the Non-Conformists are pinched with an argument, then the words of Assent and Consent are altered, and the Law-makers may say and unsay at their pleasure. If the new Act confirm the old, how can it alter the sense thereof? I grant that Laws are not the Laws of the dead, but of the living. But Law-makers may not establish Contradictions. You make the Parliament to say thus, Ministers, you shall assent and consent to all and every thing in the old Act, and consequently to use the old Book and no other: you shall not consent to all and every thing in the old Act, you shall not use the old Book. Is not this a contradiction? I do not say as you insinuate, That the two Acts are two Common-Prayer-Books. They are neither two nor one. But this I say, That if the old Act do establish one Book, and the new Act establish another Book differing from the old, and we must assent and consent to both Acts, and to every thing

thing therein, we assent to the use of two differing Books at the same time, and to subvert the design of the Parliament and the whole Frame of Conformity.

They who drew up the Specified Contents of the Book, making the two Acts a part of the Book, and the first part next after the Title-page, committed an oversight. They ought to have placed the new Act for Uniformity by itself first, then ought to have followed the Book as annexed to the Act. If you shall say, it is not material in what part of the Book the Act be placed, whether in the beginning, middle, or end. *Answ.* It is material that the words and tenour of the Act be unabsurd and true. If the words of the Act do say and express that the Book is annexed to the Act, then it is material that the Act be set entire before the Book and every part of it, and it cannot in reason be a part of the Book. If you should have placed the Appendix to your book of Confirmation immediately after the Title-page, had it not been a setting of the Cart before the horses? The old Conformists did not subscribe to the old Act when they subscribed that Article in the Canon: and the New Conformists do but subscribe to the new book with such alterations and additions as are particularly or generally mentioned in the Preface. But there is not the least mention of the Act being a part of the book.

*Sect. 18.* I have said [that the words of the Declaration concerning the Solemn League and Covenant do not say, no man is bound to endeavour the alteration of the Governors, but only

P

of

of the Government.] You advise me to retract these words, as also not to insist upon that commoner answer, that by the Government is meant only the Essentials, and not the Integrals and Accidents. *Answ.* I can freely retract any thing amiss in my Book. I retract that word *only* and no more. For that is partly an addition to the Law, though I meant innocently. But I keep to the words of the Law in saying, that the words of the Declaration do not say, no man is bound to endeavour the alteration of the Governors, but of the Government. I speak in this according to the plain letter of the Law. And for my inward thought and meaning I have sufficiently intimated, that what would have been a mans duty if that Oath had not been, that is much more his duty who hath taken that Oath. Now it is the duty of all that have not taken that Oath to do their duty to Superiors, Equals, and Inferiors, to perform their Vow in Baptism, if they be Governors to discharge the duty of Governors, if they be governed to be peaceable and to do the duty of their place, and of all in their places to pray for and endeavour the good of Church and State, the reformation of what is amiss and can well be reformed, particularly the concording of the Conformists and Non-conformists, much more is it the duty of all that have taken that Oath. Now there may be an alteration of Governors, and yet no alteration of the Government. The King is supreme, he cannot be altered. To have the least thought of deposing him is Treason before God. This were to overturn the Government. The Parliament under and with the

the King, making the supreme Judicature of the Kingdom, having Legillative power, the King adhering to them, and they to him, and both agreeing in one, cannot be deposed or altered. For this were to over-turn the Government. But all others be under the King and Parliament as to temporal Rule in things Civil, and *circa Sacra*, and even the Bishops *in Sacris* are above Presbyters and common Ministers.

But it is lawful for the King and Parliament to turn out an evil Lord Treasurer for his misdemeanours, and put in another that will better do the office. Here is a change of a Governour, but no change of the Government.

And so if a Chancellor shall misexecute his office, and commit intolerable crimes and scandals contrary to his place and trust, the King and Parliament may depose him, and put in another. Here is a change of a Governor, and yet no change of Government.

There lies no obligation upon any man to endeavour the alteration of the Government by Archbishops, Bishops, Deans, Archdeacons, Chancellors. For these offices in themselves are lawful and allowable, and they are ancient, and they may all stand better than be altered. But if any in these offices commit crimes and scandals contrary to Gods Law and the Laws of the Land, they may by just authority, and in an orderly way, be deposed, and others put in their room, and yet the Government not be changed. For my part I would have all these offices stand. Let but the door of Conformity be widened, and the Terms of Subscription moderated, so as to let in



conscientious and godly Non-conformists, and I am for no more alteration. The Solemn League and Covenant binds all the Non-conformists who have taken it upon supposition that Conformity were lawful, to conform: if they cannot conform throughout, it binds them to conform as far as they can, to be willing for peace sake and out of Conscience to do and practise so much in Conformity as their own concessions amount to, and they may do, if they will but deny themselves, and take up their Cross, and seek the publick Good, and as much as possibly lies in them live peaceably with all men.

*Scct. 19.* Concerning the Catholicon so called, you grant it is a help to those that be in doubt. It is then a help to me, and I believe to a great many more. You say, *The words make not the Bishop the publick Expositor of the Law or Book as Judge, but only as a Teacher, who bindeth but so far as he tells the truth: which is to say and unsay.* Either say that the Law makes the Bishop the publick Expositor of things in the Book, and then I shall not need to prove it: or if you grant it, why go you about by an after-distinction to ungrant it? A wise intelligent man may help the ignorant to understand things in the book, though he be neither Bishop nor Archbishop: but this doth not make him the appointed publick Expositor of things in the book, and a decisive subordinate Judge concerning things in the book in what manner to understand, do, and execute the same: *Luk. 12. 14. Man, who made me a judge or a divider over you?* If the Catholicon do not extend to the words of Subscription, the words of  
Subscri-

Subscription do clearly extend to the Catholicon, and the Catholicon extends to every matter and thing in the book, in what manner to understand, do, and execute the same; and the Bishop is made as a Judge in ordinary, and is authorized by the expresse words of the Law to take order by his discretion for the quieting and appeasing of doubts and differences arising upon things in the book. This is so plain and clear, that by no wit can it be evaded. I have granted to you, and remain in it, that the Bishop may not order and determine matters contrary to what is in the book.

You call this Catholicon *Samsons* hair, and the main strength of my book. But why did you not set it down in your Non conformists plea for peace? Had you written for victory, and intituled your book, *The Non-conformists Plea for Non conformity, or against Conformity*; or as another late Author, *The Non-conformists Advocate*, perhaps it had been less looked for from you to have inserted this seemingly at least material passage. But when you call your book a Plea for Peace, and obliquely, if not directly, charge the Conformists for using stretches and false dealings and dishonest shifts, it had been but fair and equal to have recited this passage, though you had confuted it, that they who read your book, might perceive by this passage, that the Conformists have some colour for what they do, yea just and honest reason to take things in such sense as *Cranmer, Ridley, Hooper, Grindal, Hall, Davenant, Brownrigg*, and more such Bishops, were they now living, would allow and determine to be the sense of the Law and Book. The late Co-

venanters in *England*, *Scotland*, and *Ireland* had not such security for their Consciences in the taking of that Oath in a sense varying from the precise letter, as the Conformists have for their Subscription to the Book of Common Prayer, As for the Rule about *Easter*, it is a pardonable over-sight, and is not to be charged as a falshood, the cause of Conformity and Non-conformity cannot lye upon a Criticism in Mathematicks, It being clear, that the Parliament never dream'd of any such mistake; had they known it, they would have rectified it. From the time of King *Edward* the Sixth the time of *Easter* hath been rightly observed: it was never the intention of the Parliament to cross the received use and common computation: common equity will dispense with this mistake.

Touching that Clause of taking Arms against the Kings Commissioners, I am afraid of meddling in this question. I would not baulk any difficulty. But this point is partly a State-matter. We are all agreed, that none may take Arms against the King, and that we must live peaceably under our Governors, and suffer rather than sin, and that evil is not to be done that good may come of it: and both sides agree to the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy: and that persons lawfully commissioned to what is lawful, and duly pursuing their Commission, are to be aided, assisted, and obeyed, and not resisted. Thus much I am free to declare.

When I say I know nothing required of the people but what they may submit to, I mean it of Communion in the Parish Churches, not deny-  
ing

ing them liberty to use the best means for their Souls good, so far as they may without sin.

As to that passage, that it is less matter by whom Gods work be done, so it be soundly done. Some such passage, to my remembrance, I have read in your book of Confirmation. But as I never thought that you meant any thing but what is sound and good: so I intreat you to think of me that I am against the confounding of offices, and would have every man to abide in his calling. *Alius in office matters makes aliud.*

Nor would I be thought to level and confound the outward Forms of Government among men; my meaning is no more but that a man cannot be a godly Governor in Family, Church, or State unless he be a godly man; though without godliness a man may be an excellent Artist.

You intimate that Dr. *Raynolds* and Mr. *Knewstubs* were not Conformists unless you be one. I have not Mr. *Sprints* book at hand: but I am told by one that cites him in his *Cassander Anglicanus*, pag. 163. that he assures us, "That Dr. *Humphrey*, "Dr. *Raynolds*, Dr. *Sparks*, Dr. *Chaloner*, Dr. "Ayray, Mr. *Chaderton*, Mr. *Knewstubs*, though "they stood out and testified their dislike against "sundry of the Ceremonies established, yet they "did in case of deprivation yield to them, and "studiously perswaded others in this case to this "practice.

You tax me for saying, that the Presbyterians and Independents were as bitter against one another in the late Times, as the Prelates were against both, saving violences and coercive restraints. But i. I do not say, that they were

as bitter as the worst and most bitter of the Prelates. 2. I do not think that Archbishop *Whitgift* did take Mr. *Cariwright* for an ungodly man: nor that Archbishop *Bancroft* himself did take all the Puritans and Non-conformists for graceless men. Much less do I think that *Grindal*, *Hall*, *Babington*, *Davenant*, *Morton*, and such like, did so judge. 3. But were I disposed to search into the story of the late Times, and gather proofs and citations to make good my saying, I could do it, and it may be with advantage and measure running over. From my heart I abhor recrimination. If any sin, God is wronged, and the Soul is hurt, and I will and do sorrow. I think my self not to be named with thousands which took the Solemn League and Covenant, nor to bear their books after them, nor to compare with the lowest godly Minister of what persuasion soever. Godliness I love in all. I mention not others failings willingly, I am far from rejoicing in them. If there be any word in my book tending that way, I abhor my self for it. But lest the truth should suffer by my silence in this case, and that all sides may see what cause we have to be humbled, and that none may think worse of silencing Bishops than there is cause, I will transcribe a few passages out of such Authors as I have at hand, whose testimony none can suspect in this case.

1. To my remembrance the Title of Mr. *Daniel Cawdrey's* book against Dr. *Owen*, is *Independency a great Schism*. I do not think that Bishop *Morley* and Bishop *Gunning* whom you say to have had the principal hand in the silencing of the Non-conformists,



conformists, have said much worse of Non-conformity, than one of the prime Leaders of the Presbyterian Party charged upon Independency in calling it a great Schism.

2. Mr. *Adoniram Byfield*, one of the Scribes of the Assembly of Divines in his *Beams of former Light*, pag. 210. marg. hath these words. "The Bishops themselves, some of them were not so zealous against Toleration as some of our brethren are. Pag. 203. speaking of silencing and ejection of Ministers for small or no faults, he cites you in your *Gildas Salvianus*, pag. 224. saying—— "I confess if I had my will, the man should be ejected as a negligent Pastor, that will not rule his people by Discipline. 2. Others (saith he) are for silencing and ejection, if not conform to the Discipline in particular established. In the Margin he cites the *London Petition*, Mr. P. and Mr. M. in their Writings with others. 3. There are others (saith he) on the other hand, if they had their will, those that do exercise Discipline, and suspend from the Sacrament upon that account, should in like manner be punished. He intimates an endeavour by many that all Ministers should be tyed to one Form of words in Catechising, I suppose he may mean the Assemblies Catechism, under pain of silencing and ejecting all that would not conform and subscribe thereto; which occasioned him to write that book.

3. Mr. *Bartlet* in his *Model*, pag. 29, 82. intimates and complains of many of the Presbyterian brethren, sons of the high and lofty Presbytery, as accusing the prime Asserters of the Congregational

tional way, before Heaven and Earth, of pride and arrogance, of presumption, blasphemy, and impudency, of error and heresie. Should we do by the Presbyterians as they do by us, would not the World cry shame of us, as of men wanting both Reason and Religion? And in the Margin: It seems those Presbyterians that are now so hot and violent against those that are not of their Tribe, have forgotten the Prelates practice to themselves of late.

4. Mr. *Burroughs* in his *Heart-divisions*, pag. 45. towards the end of the Chapter; and in the conclusion of his Vindication against Mr. *Edwards*, as cited by Mr. *Bartlet*, saith—— Why then is there such a stir, such an outcry against that which is called the Independent way? as if there must needs be a confusion of all things, if liberty in it be granted. The Lord judge between us and our brethren in this thing.

5. Mr. *Cradock* in his *Gospel liberty*, pag. 128. speaking of the contention between those two Parties, sets down the objection of some, thus: What, is there no more difference between them? I have heard that there is more difference between them, than between the Cavaliers and the other Party; that they are ready to cut one anothers Throats. If there be no more between them, how comes this contention among them? Mr. *Cradock* answers; I think of all the contentions that ever were among the Saints from Christs time till now, there was never such a Mystery in any contention as this.—— The Devil and our own hearts have got the strangest Mystery to set the Saints together by the ears, that ever was. So he. More I could

could cite as of the Presbyterians against the Independents, so of these against the Presbyterians. I will set down your own words, *Saints Rest*, part 1. c. 7. pag. 110. — Who that had seen how lovingly the godly in *England* did live together, when they were hated and scorned of all, would have believed that ever they would have been so bitter against one another? That when those which derided us for preaching, for hearing, for constant praying in our Families, for singing Psalms, for sanctifying the Lords day, for repeating Sermons, for taking Notes, for desiring Discipline, &c. had their mouths stopped, we should fall upon one another for the very same Duties; and that Professors of Religion should oppose and deride almost all that Worship of God out of Conscience, which others did before them through prophaness? Did I not think, that of all other, the scorning at the Worshippers of Christ, had been a sure sign of a wicked Wretch? But I see now we must distinguish between scorers and scorners, or else I fear we shall exclude almost all. I read in Pagan Writers, that the Christians were as cruel as Bears and Tigers against one another: *Ammianus Marcellinus* gives it as the reason of *Julians* policy, in proclaiming Liberty for every Party to profess and preach their own Opinions, because he knew the cruel Christians would then most fiercely fall upon one another, and so by *Liberty of Conscience*, and by keeping their children from the Schools of Learning, he thought to have rooted out Christianity from the Earth. But I had hoped this accusation had come from the malice of the Pagan Writer.

Little

Little did I think to have seen it so far verified. Lord! what Devils are we un sanctified, when there is yet such a nature remaining in the sanctified? Such a nature hath God in these days suffered to discover it self in the very godly, that if he did not graciously and powerfully restrain, they would shed the blood of one another, and no thanks to us, if it be not done. But I hope his design is but to humble and shame us by the discovery, and then to prevent the breaking forth. *Object.* But is it possible such should be truly godly? Then what sin will denominate a man ungodly? *Answ.* Or else I must believe the Doctrine of the Saints Apostasie, or believe there are scarce any godly in the World. And in the Margin, pag. 111. you say, This was written upon the War in Scotland, the death of Mr. Love, the imprisonment of many more, and an Ordinance for the Sequestering all Ministers that would not go to God on their Errands in Fasting and Prayer, or in Thanksgiving for their Successes. And an Order made to put out all Ministers from all the Cities, Market-Towns, and Garrisons, that subscribed not their engagement. So you Mr. Tho. Hooker for refusing to use the Lords Prayer customably in publick, with other causes, could not have the liberty of his Ministry with Mr. Paget at Amsterdam, when for Non-conformity he was enforced to make that his refuge. It is the manner in Scotland for him that preacheth so soon as he is in the Pulpit to be at his private devotion. Mr. G. was driven out of Edenburg, and another place afterwards for scrupling this Conformity. Mr. A. Byfields foresaid Treatise,

tise, pag. 68, 88. where also, pag. 205. may be seen an excellent Speech made by the Bishop of St. Davids in the Convocation-house, May 23. 1604. in favour of the Non conformists: Mr. Byfield makes it the summ of his Argument, and proposes it to some rigid Brethren of the late Times for their imitation. If Bishops prove not godly Bishops, it is because they were not before godly men and Presbyters. And if Presbyters be not godly, and well seasoned with the wisdom which is from above, they also may prove Church troublers, and divide, lay waste, and damage the Church, as Scripture, Church history, and Experience do witness.

I have declared and do declare, that multitudes which took the Solemn League and Covenant were men fearing God, yea men eminently holy. But I say there was never any such Covenant for Reformation before this which was begun in *Scotland*, and thence came into *England*: Oaths and publick Covenants for Reformation I acknowledge to be set down in Scripture: but not any such Oath for matter and manner as was the Solemn League and Covenant. So violent was the Parliament for the taking down of Episcopacy, that they would not hear any arguings for it, nor suffer the point to be debated before them by chosen men of either side, as they did in the case of Deans and Chapters; Mr. Byfield in his foresaid Treatise, pag. 187. Some over-zealous brethren are pleased yet to say, that the Solemn League and Covenant was *the greatest tye to Unity, and the best expedient to Reformation*. I would intreat such to weigh Mr. Calvins words,

Tom.



Tom. 7. ad Sadoletum, & de necess. reformand. Eccles. pag. 69. Verum autem nobis si contribuant Hierarchiam in qua emineant Episcopi, ut Christo subesse non recusent, in qua si fraternam charitatem inter se colant, & non alio modo quàm ejus veritate colligati, tum verò nullo non anathemate dignos fatemur si qui erunt, qui eam non reverenter & summa cum obedientia observent. If Bishops would but submit themselves to Christ, and hold fast the bond of Truth and Charity, then he thinks there is no *Anathema* of which those are not worthy, who will not reverently and with all due observance submit themselves to such Bishops. And let them consider impartially if *Usher*, *Grindal*, *Cranmer*, *Groshead*, *Hall*, *Abbot*, *Davenant*, *Babington*, *Farrar*, *Jewel*, *Downam*, *Hooper*, *Ridley*, *Latimer*, *Brownrig*, *Morton*, with many more that might be named, were not such Bishops as Mr. *Calvin* describes: how then could it be according to Unity, Moderation, and godly Wisdom and Meekness, to engage three Kingdoms in a solemn bond to endeavour all their days the extirpation of Church-government by them, making no difference between Bishops and Bishops, an *Usher* and a *Bonner*?

Though I have said that Pastor and people are no longer a Church than while the Assembly lasteth, yet I have plainly said that they are Christians; Pastor and people, both before and after, as well as during the Assembly. I acknowledge my error as to the name or word: and you will not deny but as to the thing my assertion is right. In saying they are Christians, Pastor and people, I do thereby includedly say they are a Church.

Church. Those that be left at home on the Lords day are Church-people as well as those that be at the Assembly, and they are Members of that particular Church. Use and custom hath appropriated this phrase, *The Universal Church*, to the whole company of Christians (Pastors included) throughout the World. But saving that, I do not see but that this phrase, *The Universal Church*, is applicable to that which you call a particular Church, if you do but add a place. For I take these phrases, *The Universal Church*, *the Catholick Church*, *the whole Church* to be synonymous and of the same import and signification; 1 *Cor.* 14. 23. the whole Church at *Corinth*: the whole Church at *Jerusalem*, *Act.* 15. 22. So the whole or the Universal Church of God at *Kedermister*. And I do not see but that your definition of a particular Church with your own concessions and explanations may agree to a Diocess of Churches, yea to a Nation, yea to all the Christians, Pastors and people throughout the whole World. For the whole is by your own concession but one Church, the Universal Church; and they are associated by consent, their Baptism and being Christians signifies their consent and willingness, they are a willing Society or Combination: and they consist of two parts, some are Guides and Pastors, and some are guided and people: and though they do not all come together in one place, they have Communion one with another, they are but one body, 1 *Cor.* 12. 13. and one flock of God, 1 *Pe.* 5. 2. And you grant that a particular Church may consist of many Assemblies: in case of Persecution that same Church that was wont to make  
but

but one Assembly, may for safety and just freedom and conveniency part themselves into many lesser Companies, and have distant Communion one with another in many remote Assemblies. So that in all this description there is nothing but what well suiteth with a Church as Diocesan, Provincial, National, yea all the World over. And your division of the Church into universal and particular, as I have before said, is plainly against that Rule in Logick; *Membra omnia bene divisionis debent esse inter se opposita*. But in this your division the *membra dividenda* are not *inter se opposita*. You oppose the same thing against it self. You make the Church at *Corinth* to be a particular Church. The words of the Holy Ghost do plainly assert that this phrase, The whole or the universal Church at *Corinth*, is sound and good. You plainly leave out of your description the differencing form or token of that which you call a particular Church, and that is neighbourhood, or dwelling and abiding in this or that place. It will not suffice you that the Saints at *Corinth* be godly baptized persons, and dwellers at *Corinth*, this by your and the Independent Doctrine (I use not the term in reproach, but in simplicity and for distinction sake) is not enough to make them Members of the Church of God at *Corinth*, and give them right to Church-privileges: but you make a new Essential of Church-membership and Church-communion; and lay the peace of all the Churches upon it, and say it is Divine, sure, harmless, fitted to the interest of all good men. This startles me. I strive to be silent, and cannot: the more I strive, the more I am overcome.

Mr.  
Cawdrey

Cowdrey was lately with me, and we had conference about this point: and he warranted me to set down as his judgment, that he is so far from owning the Independent Church-Covenant as necessary by Divine Law, and essential to the being of a Church, Pastor, and people, that he takes it to be one of the greatest pieces of Will-worship and teaching for Doctrines the commandments of men, that is this day extant in the Christian World. Suspecting mine own judgment, I have conferred with divers about your other Notion, two Churches or two Church-forms differing essentially, and they cannot apprehend how it can stand. You make the universal Church-form and the particular Church-form to differ essentially; and this by Divine Law. I prove to you from the nature of the thing it self, and the express Word of God, that the universal Church of God at *Corinth*, and the particular Church of God at *Corinth* are one and the same, they are not only a Catholick Church, but the Catholick Church at *Corinth*. Every Christian or Saint at *Corinth* is a Member thereof, and all put together, do make up the whole or the universal Church there. And consequently to oppose the universal and particular Church, and say they differ essentially, is to oppose the same thing against it self, and make the Lord Jesus Christ the Author and Founder of self-subverting Principles.

That one Ordinance of God doth differ from another, no man will deny. Baptism is not the same with the Lords Supper, nor either of them with preaching, praying, singing, almsgiving, Ordination, &c. There be many Ordinances of God,

Q

God, and Church-duties, which do differ one from another. If you mean in this sense, that there are two essentially different Church-forms, I shall not oppose it: but in this sense there are not two, but twenty, yea a hundred different Church-forms. By the same reason you may say, that seeing, and hearing, and eating, and drinking, and sleeping, and walking are so many essentially different forms of a man. I cannot answer this question, If Church and Church differ essentially, and this difference be by Divine Law and Sanction, never to be altered by man, what difference is there between the Church and the World, Christ and Belial?

And what more reason have you to make Pastors essential to the particular Church than to the universal, seeing it is plain, that Baptism regularly done, is done by a Minister, and every particular Church is a whole or universal Church, and the whole Church at this or that place.

As for that other point of the Church particular being a part of the Church universal, from what is before said, it may be refused. It is to say that the whole Church at *London* is a part of the whole Church, which is absurd. I have said indeed that the particular Church is to the Church universal what any Town consisting of a Magistrate governing, and people governed, according to the Rules and Principles of common Equity, is to all the World. But you may plainly perceive my scope and intent was to overthrow the Independent Church-covenant, as the constituting Form of a particular Church, and your likening the particular Church to a City or Corporation,



poration, which uses to have a particular Oath or Covenant for such as will be Free-men thereof, over and besides the Oath of Allegiance common to all Subjects. With allusion to your own similitude I did innocently *currente calamo* call it an Oath, and the Corporation-oath. Mr. *Rutherford* frequently calls it an Oath: Mr. *T. Hooker* makes it to be as the Form of a Corporation. The Independents in their Writings call it a Sacred bond, a promissory Engagement, you call it a Covenant or Voluntary self-obliging consent *in Sacrum*. And what is that less than an Oath, or Sacred bond upon the Soul, as truly as Baptism it self, and our engagement to be Christians? *Deut. 29. 11.* And therefore you might well have spared your charge or suspicion of injustice for calling it the Corporation-oath. Had you written in Greek, it may be we should have extended the word City or Corporation further than our English speech commonly means. But you writing in English to English men, we must needs think that every Corporation is not a City, nor is every Market-Town a Corporation. Are there no well-governed Subjects; Families, and Societies, unless in Cities and Corporations? Or will you confine particular Churches to Cities, Corporations, and Market-Towns? If you urge mine own concession and similitude further than my just meaning, I do plainly declare, that to say as you say, that a particular Church is a part of the universal, as a Troop is of an Army, or a City of a Kingdom; or as Mr. *Hudson* saith, that it is a part of the Church universal; as the Synagogues in *Judea* were a part of the National Church of the Jews, doth

doth directly lead to the setting up of one as Pope or chief governing Bishop and Pastor under Christ over all the Christian World, this I disown, and so do all sound Protestants, as now the Christian World is extended, and do therefore guard my assertion against any such construction. I urge my similitude no farther than the overthrow of your Church-covenant: and it serves my turn for that. Let a man come to a Town governed according to the Rules of universal Justice, and carry himself as a man, peaceably, soberly, and orderly, he hath right to be admitted, used, and treated as a man, without a particular antecedent Oath or engagement to be a Member thereof, and submit to the Government thereof, and live in the same. But your way of Church-covenanting shuts him out as a dog or swine for meet nothing but refusing your Church-covenant. I thought I might take the liberty of adding to or correcting mine own published Writings as I saw good, while I was injurious to none without any breach of civility or moral regularity. You your self hint some such thing done by you in your Premonition to your Saints Rest. My ignorant conjecture and temerity in saying that there was no Competitor at your place, I acknowledge to be an error, and intreat your pardon. I had not published my Answer to your private Question, my present resolution to accept of nothing, great or small, had it not been for the censures of many of my brethren and good people, as though I sought preferment, and were biased by worldly interest. Truly one inducement to

me to write in this cause was this, I was and am to this day conscious to my self, that if I have through Gods grace attained to the conquest of my sin in measure, as I hope I have, it is that of worldliness. Let those that seek the World stand by it, I seek it not. I will stand by God, by Truth, and a good Conscience, or by nothing. I cannot shew persons my heart. My past conversation will not be admitted for evidence against the charge of a present defection to worldliness. If Conformity be a complication of hainous crimes, as lying, perjury, covenanting against Reformation, the most solemn protestations made by one that thinks Conformity lawful in case of deprivation will not be regarded. Therefore I know no better remedy than patience, meekness, and silence. For what is past, no man can come forth and say, that I have sought my self and great things for my self in the World. For the time to come I am upon my Tryal. If I prove not sincerely free and unspotted from the vice of worldliness and inordinate seeking the things of this life, while I am militant here on Earth, let me be counted for a deceiver, and let this be produced for witness against me to my shame and condemnation.

As touching the change of my judgment in some things, it is the observation of an eminent Non conformist. There be few that set themselves to a conscientious and unprejudiced search after truth; but know (comparing what apprehensions they have had at several times) and must acknowledge, they have differed as much with themselves at times as they differ from other godly men

men at the present. Mr. Byfield aforesaid in his  
 foresaid Treatise, pag. 132. One of the greatest  
 changes in my judgment is that about unconver-  
 ted mens right to Sacraments. If I have changed  
 for the worse, I may safely say it is of meer er-  
 rour and simplicity, and that I have denied my  
 self. But for the present I do not see but that my  
 change is warrantable. As for your way, that  
 none but the sincere have right to Sacraments  
 before God, and none but the seemingly sincere  
 have right before the Church: I do not see but  
 that according to this opinion Christ was bound  
 to judge *Judas* at the Passover sincere whom he  
 knew to be a Devil; and all those to be sincere,  
 who by his order were baptized, many whereof  
 he knew to be unsound and unregenerate. The  
 Scripture saith, *Many are called, but few are cho-*  
*sen*: but according to your Doctrine we must be  
 bound to believe all baptized by *John* and the  
 Apostles, at the time of their Baptism to be both  
 called and chosen, both seeming and sincere  
 Christians, which were to contradict Gods word.  
 I will not judge *Simon Magus* who offers himself  
 to Baptism to be a child of the Devil and unsi-  
 cere, nor am I bound presently to judge him si-  
 cere. I may judge him to be one whom I am to  
 baptize, and suspend my judgment as to his in-  
 ternal estate before God, why may there not be  
 a suspension of a mans judgment in such a case?  
*Gal. 4. 20. I stand in doubt of you.* God hath not  
 bound me to believe beyond evidence. Scripture  
 plainly saying, That all are not *Israel* that are of  
*Israel*, and that many are called, but few chosen,  
 and experience in all Ages witnessing, that many  
 within

within the Church prove hypocrites and ungodly, how can I be bound to believe every one baptized by John and the Apostles, at the time of their Baptism to be sincere? And doth not God himself plainly confute your opinion, when he alloweth of the peoples outward words, profession and covenanting, and yet detecteth the unsoundness of their hearts, *O that there were a right heart within them, Deut. 10. 18, 19.*

This position, That none have right to Sacraments before God but the regenerate, is universal, extending to the times under the Law as well as those under the Gospel. Nothing is more plain than that all the Congregation did by Warrant from God, *Exod. 12.* eat of the Passover, and did all enter into Covenant with God, *Deut. 10. 16, 17, 18.* And nothing is more plain than that many of them were hypocrites, false hearted, and rebellious before God.

According to your opinion unregenerate men must do meer nothing, but pine away in their sins. For this is your strong reasoning against them. First they are to repent, and then to come. This is Gods order, and they sin if they do not observe it. I grant what you say. But withal add, that they do equally sin in all that they do till they are converted and in a state of grace and reconciliation with God. Not that I do think there is no difference between the best and worst works of the unregenerate, such actions as are materially good and such as are materially evil. I do not think so. But the very best works of an unregenerate man do not please God. So as the regenerate do. The unregenerate is in a state of



of long yea of gross sin and disorder, his first work is found repentance and conversion: and till he be a sincere Convert he is in a state of disorder and damnation. But what then? must he pine away in his sins? must he not eat, and drink, and sleep, and marry, and follow a calling, and keep himself alive for conversion, and hear, and read, and pray, and meditate in order to conversion? And why in like manner must he not submit to Baptism, and come to the Lords Supper? *The Sacraments have this peculiar to them above the Word (saith Mr. Calvin which he confirms out of Austin) that they do represent unto us to the life the promises of Gods Word as if they were pictured in a Table before our eyes* Iustit. l. 4. c. 14. sect. 5. 6. This is clear from Gods Word that even unto the carnal Israelites, as mingled with the godly, did pertain the Adoption, and the Glory, and the Covenants, and the giving of the Law, and the Service of God, and the Promises, Rom. 9. 4. Psal. 147. 19, 20. And he that shall say these do not include the Sacraments, doth diminish from Gods Word. Now Gentile Christians do succeed into the Rights and Privileges of the Jews, Gods people of old, Rom. 11. 17. Sure Jews and Gentiles are not losers by the Coming of Christ. But if under the Gospel carnal Worshippers and Hypocrites be debarred from the Sacraments, they are losers by the Coming of Christ, and the grace and benediction of the Gospel is less than that of the Law. If it be no privilege to sit with Christ at his Table, to be among his Saints, and to be admitted to Gods Institutions and Sacraments, then it is no penalty to be debarred and excommunicated, and then it is all one whether people come to the Sacra-

Sacrament or no; and whether they be Infidels or Christians; and then it is no sin to despise the Sacraments, and there is no such thing as worthy and unworthy receiving.

Did Jesus Christ expect that all persons before Baptism would be sincere? He well foresaw the diseased state of sinners, and that either unregenerate ones must be baptized and admitted unto his medicinal means, or there would be but a slender Church in this World. According to your opinion, for fear of perfidiousness and hypocrisy, it were good to let people be unbaptized all their days, till just when they are going out of the World; or after they have attained to sound conversion and assurance thereof.

You say in your *Saints Rest* of such as do something in Religion, though not enough, perhaps their place in Hell may be the easier, and so their labour is not lost; though as to the obtaining of Salvation it is all lost; *Part 3. c. 6. sect. 14. pag. 374.*

And saith Mr. Robert Bolton in his *Saints self-inriching Examination*; pag. 81. I am perswaded that

those who have utterly wanted the Ministry of the Word; and those who having enjoyed it, have joyed in it, and have in some measure submitted themselves to it, shall have fewer stripes, and less torment in Hell, than those who having it long shining bright upon them, have still lain stark frozen in their dregs, and utterly blind in matters of Heaven; and those who having been often washed with many plentiful showers from Heaven, have still continued Blackmores, scornful and rebellious to grace and godliness. So he.

I do make a great difference between sinners and sinners, unconverted and unconverted, between

tween doing something and doing nothing, striving and not striving, yielding, flexible and teachable sinners, and obstinate contemners of Discipline, teaching, and instruction; who when Pearls are tendered to them, do play the dogs and swine indeed, and turn again and rent the givers.

And I do not think that the most bold and confident Professors, who can say, I renounce the World, the Flesh, and Satan, and I believe in God, and I do vow and promise to lead a godly life, are always the most sincere. They which can say, *The desire of our souls is in thy Name*, Isa. 26. 8. and *We desire to fear thy Name*, Neh. 1. 11. may have more sincerity in them than the other. It is true Philip saith to the Eunuch, *If thou believest with all thine heart, thou maist be baptized*. And he answered and said, *I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God*, Act. 8. 37. But that man in the Gospel could scarce pronounce so; but rather, *I believe, Lord, help my unbelief*. So I repent, Lord, help my unrepentance. I consent unto thy Covenant, Lord, help my weak heart. I renounce the World, O help me to renounce it thoroughly, sincerely, and fully. Thy Kingdom come, thy will be done in Earth as in Heaven. O help me to pray these petitions to purpose. If a Pagan should come to me and say, I am convinced it is my duty to be a sincere Christian, and that unless I be a Christian and sincere, I am undone: at present I fear I am not a thorough Convert, the work of Grace is not thoroughly wrought in me, I strive, I pray, my desire is after God, though not so strong as it should be, I desire you

will baptize me, and let me be under Christs  
 blessing means and within his Church, I would  
 baptize this man. And in like sort I would ad-  
 mit him to the Lords Supper. Such persons as  
 being unregenerate for the present do shew them-  
 selves teachable, and willing to learn, and to use  
 the Sacraments in concurrence with all other  
 means, such I conceive Christs Ministers may  
 admit to Sacraments, being guilty of no outward  
 intolerable crimes and scandals.

There is a mean between Pelagianism and An-  
 tinoianism. The duties of the unconverted  
 please not God as do the duties of the converted:  
 but yet God hath commanded them duties, and  
 he hath prescribed them means to use: and no  
 man to this day ever went as far as he was able  
 by the help of that Grace which he had, and had  
 came to repent. If I must perish, I had rather  
 perish repenting, and praying, and fearing God,  
 and using endeavours for my Soul, and doing  
 as far as I could, than doing just nothing at all.  
 And I know no one word in all the Bible exem-  
 pting the unregenerate from the use of the Sacra-  
 ments, and the obedience of God therein, any  
 more than from other Duties and Ordinances.  
 When therefore I call the unregenerate to the  
 Sacrament, it is in such sort as I do to prayer,  
 and therewith to repentance and faith in God  
 and a holy life.

Either Regeneration is of the essence of Sacra-  
 ments, or it is not. If not, then there may be  
 Baptism and other Sacraments without it. If yea,  
 then where is no regeneration, Baptism is a nul-  
 lity, and by the same reason all other Sacra-  
 ments:

ments: yea and the Apostleship and Ministry of *Judas*; and of all unsanctified Ministers; yea and the Marriage of the unregenerate; and the office of unsanctified Judges, Magistrates, &c. where any one essential is wanting; it is as if the whole were wanting. But all sides do agree, that *Judas* was an Apostle; and had his calling and office from Christ; and that the want of regeneration doth not make null the office and calling of Ministers and Magistrates, and that Husbands and Wives, though unregenerate, are lawful Husbands and Wives before God and the World; and not Fornicators. But if regeneration be essential to Sacraments, so that without it there can be no Baptism, no Lords Supper, no Ordination, no Marriage, then what a case is the World and all the Churches in, and what confusion would it breed? *Object.* Will you say that regeneration is not of the essence of Sacraments? He is not a Jew who is one outwardly; neither is that Circumcision which is outward in the flesh. *Answer.* Regeneration is of the essence of Sacraments in such sort as it is of Ordination to the Ministry, and Marriage, and such other external duties and offices: that is, the persons ought first to be regenerate, and marry themselves spiritually to Christ before they enter upon outward and worldly Marriage: and they sin in breaking this order. But since they do by their own sin intangle themselves in a necessity of marrying unregenerate, they are to marry, though unregenerate: and the Marriage is good and allowable before God and all the World. For *Marriage is honourable in all*: and they are no more Fornica-



Fornicators than those Husbands and Wives which are regenerate. Regeneration is of the essence of doing every thing well as it should be done: and there is nothing in this World so necessary as it. But yet the unregenerate must marry, and be in callings and offices. When the Apostle says, *That is not Circumcision which is outward in the flesh*: the meaning is no more but this, That bare outward Circumcision profiteth not to Salvation without the Circumcision of the heart, (I speak of the Adult.) and so upon the matter it is as to Salvation as no Circumcision. But yet it is real outward Circumcision before God, and no nullity. But if it were a nullity, all the unregenerate males in *Israel* so soon as they are regenerate must be re-circumcised: and all that be unregenerate and baptized must, when they are regenerate, be rebaptized, and in case of a relapse by a mortal sin, or some dangerous recidivation which doth contract *reatum damnabilem*, and without repentance whereof there can be no pardon, *Gal. 3. 19.* upon the parties return and recovery there must be a new Baptism, Circumcision, &c. which is utterly against Scripture, Reason, and the Judgment of the Catholick Church.

*Object.* If you shall say of the unregenerates Marriage, *Fieri non debet, factum valet.*

*Ans.* I answer, *Fieri debet*, and therefore much more *factum valet*. The unregenerate must marry: *fieri debet*. *Judas* is called to the office of an Apostle: he is bound to accept it: *fieri debet*. God doth not license the married to be unregenerate: but he is pleased to tolerate it, or else there will be no Church nor World.

*Object.*

*Object.* If you shall say that the outward part in Sacraments, as Circumcision, Ordination, Marriage, &c. is well done, and needs not to be repeated, though the party be unregenerate.

*Answer.* This is to destroy your own Cause. By this you grant that the unregenerate may and are to be baptized, and consequently may be allowed other Sacraments.

The truth is, this opinion that the unregenerate have no right to Baptism before God, leads to that levelling Principle, *Dominium fundatur in gratia*, exploded by all sound Divines and Christians, yea and by Pagans. I shall grant that an unregenerate man hath no comfortable right to any one thing so as the regenerate hath. For there is no peace to the wicked. He is every moment liable to damnation. But God is pleased to bear with him, and to allow him propriety in these outward things. And so he is, pleased to bear with his unregeneracy, and alloweth and commandeth him to marry, to be ordained Minister, Magistrate, &c. to come to Sacraments, in order to Conversion, and in hopes in time to be better: or if he attain not to sound Conversion and Salvation, to be something civil and orderly, to be restrained from gross sin, and be of some use in Family, Church, or Commonwealth, to be less sinful, and so to have less torment in Hell. For Hell being a rational torment, the Conscience of a damned man cannot torment him for what was good in him. Though some doubt whether there be degrees of glory in Heaven: yet all grant there are degrees of torment in Hell. He that knew his Lords will, and did it not, shall be

be beaten with many stripes. He that knew not his Lords will, and yet did things worthy of stripes, shall be beaten but with few stripes. The Apostle saith, *It is better to marry than to burn*: and consequently the Conscience of a man in Hell, who when he was upon Earth, chose rather to marry than to burn, will so far acquit him, or torment him less than if he had lived in burning lust and Whoredom.

Our Divines against the Papists grant, that in a large sense Marriage is a Sacrament. All do grant that the unregenerate may marry: and that the want of regeneration doth not make Marriage to be null. The case is the same as to Baptism and other Sacraments. If regeneration be of the essence of Sacraments, then it is of the essence of all: or if you say it is of some only, and not of all, prove what you say, and shew a reason why it is of some only, and not of all. *Ad quatenus ad omne, &c.* Marriage is by a mutual Covenant, *Mal. 2. 14.* The unregenerate wanting holy motives and ends, and the Spirit of God, cannot make nor perform the Marriage-covenant so as the regenerate can. Now if you define Marriage by inward gracious rectitude, and make regeneration one essential, you make all unregenerate married folks Fornicators, and unclean, meerly for want of regeneration: which were new and strange Doctrine.

*Object.* But what is this to Baptism and the Lords Supper? These are Covenants of Godliness and Christianity: so is not Marriage.

*Answ.* Marriage is a Covenant of one branch of Godliness and Christianity. For the duties of Husbands

Husbands and Wives are a part of Godliness. Regeneration is as essential to the right performance of Marriage duties as of any other, and as essential to the right making of the Marriage-vow as of the Baptismal vow. *Object.* In Marriage they engage to be Husband and Wife: in Baptism the party baptized engageth to be a Christian, a Saint, a godly man. *Ans.* In Marriage the unregenerate do not covenant with godly minds. And in Baptism the unregenerate may covenant with desires after godliness, with preparatory Grace, with conviction, compunction, humiliation, desires after God, and some common workings of the Spirit which are better than none, and which lead to more. *Object.* The unregenerate cannot discern Christs body. *Ans.* He cannot discern Christs body as the regenerate can: no more can he do any other Duty or Ordinance of God. He cannot look upon anything with a spiritual eye, so as can the regenerate; 1 Cor. 2:14. But all grant there is common Faith, and preparatory Grace; the unregenerate may have this: and by this he may discern Christs body, though not so as the regenerate can. *Object.* But how can they which are dead eat? *Ans.* How can they which are dead read, hear, pray, cogitate? The naturally dead can do nothing. But they which are naturally alive can eat: and though they be dead in sin, passions and sins, they are not so dead, but that through the help of common grace they be able to do something, and that something leads to more. *Object.* He that is not in Covenant with God can

can have no right to the Seal: for the Seal followeth the Covenant. *Answ.* The Covenant and the Seal concur and go together. By Baptism we do *ipso facto* enter into Covenant with God. The Seal doth not follow the Covenant; but it is *simul & semel* with the Covenant. He that sets his Hand and Seal to a Bond, doth thereby oblige himself, the Obligation commenceth thereby.

*Object.* The ungodly are *ipso jure* excommunicate: and no excommunicate person is to be admitted. *Answ.* Judas was ungodly, and *ipso jure* excommunicate, yet did Christ admit him to the Passover, and so he did multitudes of ungodly ones to Baptism; and under the Law God obliged the unregenerate to come to the Passover. We must distinguish between *ipso jure* excommunicate, and *ipso jure* excommunicate. Such as be guilty of capital crimes, and be obstinate in gross unrepented Heresie or scandal, so as to be intolerable, these are the *ipso jure* excommunicate, whom we must exclude. But yielding, teachable, tolerable, unregenerate ones we may admit: yet are they *ipso jure* excommunicate, 1 Cor. 16. 22.

*Object.* The unregenerate are but Saints equivocally. *Answ.* They are by Baptism married to Christ, and are nearer Gods Grace, Conversion, and Salvation than meer Pagans: For Salvation is of the Jews, and so of the Christians.

Were I minded to be contentious, there is one expression of yours which doth overthrow the Church, and Sacraments, and Christianity it self; but I know your meaning to be sound. It



is this, *That the door of the visible Church is incomparably wider than the door of Heaven.* Certainly the door of the Church and of Heaven is the same; for Heaven hath its beginning in this World. And it is regeneration which is the Church-door and the door of Heaven. And the division of the Church into visible and invisible is as if you should say one and the same thing is both visible and invisible. That which we call the Church invisible is visible to God. And as the Apostle says, *All are not Israel that are of Israel*; so all are not the Church, which are of the Church; yet is there some difference between an unregenerate Christian and a Pagan, as there is between a dead man and a brute. The Church visible and invisible are not two contrary Churches, nor have they two contrary doors, a narrower and a wider. But the Church is one, consisting of none but regenerate and gracious ones (understand me of the adult) yet are not Hypocrites and Christians unregenerate, meer Pagans. Christians and Church people they are in a sense; but as I have before said, it is *cum termino diminutive*, equivocally: but yet it is warrantable speaking, so it be cautiously understood. And God is pleased to tolerate them in his Church outwardly, as tares among wheat, as knowing who are his, and whom he hath a thought and purpose in himself to convert and make sincere; and how to make use of other wicked ones tolerated also in his Church outwardly for his own glory and the good of his Elect. I cite this expression of yours, not as condemning it, but as opening, excusing, and defending it *farre forth*. I need the like to  
 your

your my self I am sensible as to many things. Moreover, the nature of a Standard is to be *index sui & obliqui*, so plain as to need no other Standard. But credible profession or seeming sincerity is an uncertain Standard, and varies as mens judgments vary, and many times as their interest and passions rule and sway them. And that which will satisfy one, will not satisfy another. There will need a Standard beside to tell us what is a credible profession, and who are to be reputed real Saints. And you your self do not keep to your own Standard. For you say verbal serious profession is enough for admission to Baptism. But if the same person after his Baptism prove perfidious and unsound, he is to be put from the Lords Supper, and is not to be believed upon his bare word without further evidences of sincerity and tokens of reformation. I do only argue *ad hominem* that this is to go from your own standard. If verbal serious profession be the standard, why do you not keep to it? If it be not, why do you say it is, and oblige us to baptize *Simon Magus* and such like upon it? The standard in this case is deliberate sober covenanting with God, or a voluntary engaging of our selves to be the Lord's, this hath all the properties of a just and even standard between God and Souls, as between Husband and Wife. The want of regeneration makes it not to be no engagement or binding Oath and Covenant on our part. A Covenant or engagement it is: and it is a Covenant binding us to all that the godly are bound to. But he that is unregenerate may not say I am regenerate, for that were to ly. In co-

venanting with God he must do as he doth in Prayer, hallowed be thy Name, thy Kingdom come, &c. he must desire with his heart, and express his desires with his tongue, though by reason of his present impotency and unregeneration his desires after God are not so strong as his desires after the World. So he may say, I consent to be a Christian, I do willingly enter into Covenant with God, and engage my self to be his servant. His tongue doth utter the willing consent and resolution of his heart, in such sort as it doth in Prayer, thy will be done in Earth as it is in Heaven. There is but this difference, the one is a desire, the other is a willing consent: in Prayer we utter desires; in covenanting with God we utter the willing consent of our minds. There is hypocrisie in both, and there is no worse hypocrisie in the one than in the other. For when he saith, Thy will be done on Earth as it is in Heaven, he doth not sincerely pray this petition. And when he covenanteth with God, and voweth himself to be his Servant, there is some desire, purpose, consent, and resolution to be so, through Gods grace assisting, though alas the flesh is master, and for the present he is overcome of his lust. It is not to be denied but that their want of regeneration is great and horrible sin: but how will you remedy it? would you have all the unregenerate to stay from Baptism till they feel themselves regenerate? or would you have them to refrain from Prayer till they can pray acceptably? You your self say these words in your *Directions for Peace of Conscience*, pag. 50. *Do not those men deserve to be exterminated the Churches and Societies*

*Societies of the Saints, who dare say to a wicked Unbeliever, desire not faith, desire not to leave thy wickedness: desire not Grace, or Christ, or God?*

And what may we think of those which say to a wicked Unbeliever, Do not covenant thy Soul to God, do not become a Christian, do not yield to Baptism, Godliness, and Christianity?

You say afterwards *ibid. pag. 51.* Indeed if these blind Seducers had ever heard our Ministers perswading wicked men to dissemble and lye to God, and ask Faith, Grace, and Christ with their tongues, but not desire them in their hearts, then had they sufficient grounds for their reviling language. I may therefore boldly conclude, that they that find themselves Unbelievers, that is, unwilling to have Christ to deliver them from sin, must use this second means to get Faith, even earnest frequent Prayer for it to God. So you. No more do we in calling the unregenerate to the Sacraments perswade them to dissemble and lye to God, and say one thing with their tongues, and mean another thing with their hearts. We call them but to do that in the use of the Sacraments, which you call them to do in Prayer. But do you name but one Scripture where God counteth it abomination in the same man to partake of the Sacraments, and no abomination in him to pray? or do but by sound substantial reason make evident what more lying and dissimulation is committed by the same man in being baptized and coming to the Lords Supper, than is in praying the Lords Prayer. You grant and say in your *Treatise of Conversion, pag. 153, 154.* That there are some actions of the unconverted

that are in order to their conversion, which though they please not God as the works of the regenerate do, yet he abhorreth them not as he doth their sins: for as they come from a common Faith, though not from a special Faith, so they may please God in a common manner, though not in a special: And as they have an end that is good in its place, that is, the saving of their Souls by turning from their sins, though they have not the true ultimate end of the Saints, that is, the glory and pleasing of God everlastingly, and the enjoyment of him therein, so are they proportionably acceptable to God. So you.

Now that reading, hearing, and praying done by the same unconverted man should be acceptable to God in a common manner, and that his being baptized and coming to the Lords Supper, should not also be acceptable to God in a common manner, is hard to me to conceive. Is it acceptable to God in a common manner for the same man to say, Our Father which art in Heaven, hallowed be thy Name, &c. and is it abomination to God for the same man to be baptized in the Name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; and to eat and drink hallowed Bread and Wine in remembrance of Jesus Christ?

Moreover, where hath God bound all his Apostles and Ministers to the Worlds end to believe all to be real Saints. and regenerate whom it is their duty to baptize? I speak of adult ones. No one word in Scripture hath laid this necessity upon us. As for the Law of Nature, and custom of Nations, it obligeth us not to believe beyond evidence. We have no sufficient evidence to compel our belief that



that every baptized person is sincere: we have much evidence to the contrary, as I have before shewed. And if there could not be a suspension or forbearance of judgment either way, why should the Apostle say, *Those that are without, God judgeth.* As if he should say, I judge neither way, I leave them to God. Men of wise and humble understandings are prone to suspend their judgment in cases of doubt and difficulty. As to the state of Heathens, we know for certain, that without holiness no man shall see God: but whether in those places where Heathenism reigns there be any as *Lot in Sodom*, sincerely holy, is a thing which we may well leave to God, as having no call that I know of to judge either way. Those that are without, God judgeth. I commit no uncharitableness in not judging *Simon Magus* either way as to the present. When *Saul* was come to *Jerusalem*, he essayed to joyn himself to the Disciples, but they were all afraid of him, and believed not that he was a Disciple, *Act. 9. 26.* Where the case is such, that a man cannot suspend his judgment, but must pronounce the one way or the other, there a man is to determine himself, and pronounce with the one or the other. But where we have no call to judge, there our judgment may rest, we may say neither way: but taking what is clear, the rest which is doubtful and uncertain we may leave to God, or till further time have made it evident. That *Simon Magus* and many such do owne Christianity, and willingly offer themselves to be baptized, and to enter into Covenant with God, is clear and plain. And this is enough for my admitting of

him to the Lords Supper. And this all along from *Abrahams* time to this day hath been the standard of admission to Sacraments both under the Law and under the Gospel, *Gen. 34. 14, 15, 16. Deut. 29. 10, 11, 12. Mat. 3. 5, 6. Joh. 3. 26, Joh. 4. 1, 2. Mat. 28. 19, 20.* But that God hath bound his Ministers to admit none to Sacraments whom they have just ground and reason to judge not sincere in their profession, or whom they cannot positively conclude to be regenerate, is an addition to Gods Word. Such as *Christus* himself, were he upon Earth, would admit to Sacraments, such his Ministers acting in his Name and by his Authority may admit. But *Christ* is God, and he did knowingly admit many a one to the Sacrament of Baptism, and *Judas* to the Passover whom he knew to be unregenerate. There is a difference between the general Vow or Covenant of Christianity; and particular Oaths, Vows, Covenants, Protestations, Promises, and Agreements; as between Husband and Wife, Master and Servant, Prince and Subject, Man and Man, Kingdom and Kingdom, and so in subscribing humane Tests and Engagements. These particular Pacts and Covenants be more in a mans power. Even an unregenerate man may do them, though he cannot do them with holy ends and motives so as the regenerate can. But do them he may, so as to be an honest man before the World, and free from the crime of Perjury, Perfidiousness, Equivocation, and on false Dealing. Therefore their sin is the greater who want common honesty, and fail to do those things which even Publicans and Heathens, and the

the common sort of sinners may do and ordinarily do. But now the want of honesty, regeneration, and sincerity towards God is and hath been all along not only the state of Pagans and persons without, but even of Profelytes, professors, and persons within. The Scripture and Experience is abundant in proof. The want of honesty and soundness towards God is the summ of all iniquity, the great damning sin: but it is the ordinary state of thousands within the Church, and will be so to the worlds end. It is a case that cannot be remedied, save by God. God out of his goodness is pleased to tolerate it: but in the end every man shall have according to his works. It is the unsanctification of the heart which is the great malady of diseased Souls. And if you let the adult be unbaptized till they be regenerate, I fear they will be much worse. It is a plausible temptation, thou canst not say these words, Thy kingdom come, thy will be done, &c. with a through sincere heart, therefore do not say them at all. Thou canst not go down upon thy knees while unregenerate, and make an acceptable prayer to God, therefore let it alone, and pray just none at all. Such Doctrine seems like theirs who would not have children taught the Lords Prayer, the Creed, and Commandments for fear of taking Gods Name in vain. But I think that such Doctrine, though it have a shew of Holiness, and avoiding Hypocrisie, is no other than the licentious or deluding Devil transforming himself into an Angel of light, or rather into an Angel of licentiousness. Do not strive at all, go straight to Hell by open wickedness,

ness, and gross neglect of Gods means, and harbour a sweet sin in thy bosom, which may justify thy total neglect of all the means of Grace and Sanctification. I warrant us, when we have said and done all we can to bring people to the use of the outward means, there are thousands of graceless ones will not use them. And therefore the just and true mean, so far as I am able to discern in these Controversies, is between the extreme of Pelagianism on the one hand, and of Antinomianism on the other hand. And that the unconverted must use Baptism and the Lords Supper as medicinal helping means in concurrence with the Word and Prayer, *cum animo redempti*, with the best of their desires, affections, purposes, resolutions, and endeavours: bewareing especially of presumption and self mistake. I rest in the distinction of our practical Divines, such as Mr. Joseph Allein, Mr. Richard Allein, Mr. Swinmock, and others, who do use to distinguish between resolved and returning sinners. The prayers of the former are abomination with God. But the prayers of returning sinners, who have not yet attained to sound Conversion, though God hath not absolutely bound himself to give them conversion upon their prayer, yet there is a may be in the case, *Simon Magus* must repent and pray God, if perhaps the thought of his heart may be forgiven him, *Act: 8.* In like manner must they come to Sacraments: *ubi lex non distinguit, nobis non est distinguendum.* If any by Heresie or open scandals do make themselves intolerable, let them be cast out. Where publick admonition and calling persons to publick Confession can be done,

done, let it be done. I am not against, but for a just use of Discipline and Church censures. This is my judgment in this matter, which I impose on none, if any think otherwise, he shall not be a jot the less acceptable to me, I will make no contention. And in the course of my Ministry, if I have any occasion to make mention of this point, especially among such as may be of a contrary mind, it shall be with such evidence, caution, and moderation, as shall warrant me before God and the World to be no self-seeker, nor turbulent and unpeaceable. If the Reader blame me for repetitions of the same thing, blame me as thou pleasest; but allow me to help mine own understanding, and such others as are no wiser than my self, by such repetitions. Men of narrow understandings cannot grasp a great deal at once, and knowledge with me is not easily got. Your rigid insisting on the words of assent and consent to all and every thing, ~~and~~ occasioned me to set down that passage of Gods assenting to the use of mens sins, though not to the sins themselves, which I do penitently retract; as also what you can justly tax in the misdistribution of Orders in the Ministry. My meaning was no more but to prove that we may honestly assent to the use of a mistranslated Text, or of a Form of Prayer defectively worded and methodized, and yet not hereby assent that the Text might not be better translated, and the Prayer be better worded and methodized.

Mr. *Alford* taxes me with much sharpness for saying it is lawful in some cases to set up a post by Gods post, though Ezek, 43. 8. charge it as a  
sin:



**Ans.** To come like a young Sophister before the Majesty of God with his *nego mihiorem*; to give the counterbuff to the peremptory Word of God was (indeed it was) a little severe upon the Almighty: where God denies, none may presume to affirm.

**Ans.** If this my expression had been so faulty as you make it, I suppose Mr. Baxter, whose wisdom and fineness is not inferiour to yours, would not have passed it over in silence. But, Reverend Sir, I ask you: our Saviour saith expressly, *It was not lawful for David and his men to eat of the Shew-bread, but for the Priests only*, Mat. 12. 4. Was it lawful for David and his men to eat thereof; or was it not? If you say it was, you go against the express letter, and condemn your self in condemning me: if you say it was not, you contradict the scope and true meaning, yea the express letter, ver. 7. The Scripture saith expressly in Rom. 4. several times and elsewhere, that Faith is counted or imputed for Righteousness. The Assembly of Divines in their Confession, and the Congregational Brethren in their Confession say, Faith is not counted or imputed for Righteousness. I would not have you lash the reverend and worthy Authors of these two Confessions at that rate you do me, though my saying is as harmless, if not more than theirs.

You say the signification of the word *Order* hath been so fixed by the universal consent of all Learned Writers, that it were great folly to loosen it. **Ans.** If then with the Scripture I shall say that the Deacons office is a degree, 1 Tim. 3. 13. I shall fear being charged by you

with

with folly, as going against the universal consent of all Learned Writers. If I recede from the Scripture, and say it is an order, rather than a degree, I shall be charged by you for giving the counterbuff to the peremptory Word of God. The sense of the Law is the Law, and not the bare letter.

Had you studied the Art of Healing more and of wounding less, and taught your Pen to be more mild and less Satyrical, I think wise men would not think you less learned, holy, and zealous for Gods glory. It grieves me because of your hard words and censures, not as against my self, but upon your own account and the Publick; that I should by any misword give you the least occasion. Though you shall call me a thousand times a Devil, and write Books of reproaches and Sarcastical wit against me, I will acknowledge you an excellent Servant of God, and love you and all the Non-conformists for your sake the more. There are some that reproach the Non-conformists for men of no wit: your Writings may be of use to convince them. But take heed, while you write either against Conformity or Conformists, that you do not by your strains of wit, want of healing, and pacifactory mildness damage the common Cause, and grieve the pious, peaceable, and moderate of both sides; make not too much odds between the Pulpit and the Press. It is an excellent thing in writing of Controversies to write with convincing mildness. I say not this as a Reprover, as blaming you, or excusing my self; but as one that needeth reproof my self, and as desirous that others  
be

be wise by my harms, and that our many breaches may not be made more and greater by well-meaning Writers on either side. I must needs judge that you sincerely wish well to my Soul. I do sincerely thank you. To the rest of your Paper I return you silent meekness.

*Reverend Sir, my Father, and faithful Friend*  
*Mr. Baxter.*

**Y**OU seem to pose the Church-men in your Writings with this Question, *What is the pars regens of this which you call the Church of England?* The consideration hereof was one inducement to me to compose the leading part of this Book, which I had begun before your Book against me came out, and had thought to have sent it out alone. But upon second thoughts I determined to let all go together. It is no small grief to me to have been thus engaged in writing against you. For me to say my understanding is above yours, would be counted pride: and how to go against mine own understanding I know not. So that I am in a great strait. I cannot think my understanding equal with yours: I renounce the very thought thereof, and am truly ashamed of my self upon some accounts for attempting so much as publickly to gainsay any thing maintained by you. On the other hand, my Judgment being mine own, I must needs act by it while it is as it is. If either I have misrepresented or mistook your Doctrine; I shall be willing and ready to be undeceived, and to make you all possible reparation to my power. If there be nothing of weight

weight in my reasonings, they will be their own confutation. And if it be ingratitude and a breach of friendship, seasonably to stand up for that which is conceived to be truth, then I confess I am deeply guilty, and can have no excuse. *Let me (says Luther) be reputed proud, covetous, an Adulterer, a Murtherer, an enemy to the Pope, guilty of all kind of vices; so I be not guilty of wicked silence, when the Lord Christ suffers.* Ep. ad Stanpitium. I like his zeal better than his words. I shall crave leave to add these following Cautions and Explications, lest I be misjudged.

1. In the point of Re-ordination, I desire I may be held to this only, As the present case is with us in *England*; no more being in question, no more would I assert, nor move dispute about any more, much less about Re-baptization: Some Independents do flatly assert Ordination, *toties quoties*, so often as a Minister hath Call to remove to another Church, *The Preacher sent*, p. 278. This I am clearly against. It floweth from the nature of the Church-Covenant, which I forgot to name in my Arguments.

2. I do hold with you, That where a man lies under the charge of gross sin, and is of suspected or forfeited credit, we are to beware how we trust such a mans bare words and profession, without real proofs of amendment. The truth is, your opinion and disputation, That we must repute all for sincere in order to Baptism, who do make a verbal serious profession of godliness; hath been a snare to me. I do now more than suspect it to be unsound. And  
I do

I do not see, but that it is as hard to judge what is a credible profession, and who is to be counted a credible Christian; as to judge what is true godliness, and who is to be counted a godly man. You your self say in your Assize-Sermon upon 1 Cor. 6. 19, 20. *I'll never trust that man far, if I know him, that's false to his Redeemer,* p. 43. Now that is every Christian Professour not regenerate. To say we must admit all that make a credible profession, and none but them, is to say *idem per idem*; for nothing will prove a mans profession credible, but what doth prove him credible and regenerate. And if we make heart-sincerity and inward Grace the standard, we must admit all or none. There is some credibility due to the worst, as to common matters. But no man can see into anothers heart, and nothing is more common than false profession, presumption, and unsound heartedness in the Christian world. The Tares in the Parable were as visible as the Wheat, otherwise the servants would not have asked, Shall we pluck them up? nor would Christ have said, Let both grow till the Harvest. And if it be no part of Christs meaning, that the Tares, visible Hypocrites, be tolerated outwardly in the Church, and admitted to external priviledges; then it is no part of his meaning, that the Wheat, visible Saints, be tolerated outwardly in the Church, and be admitted to Church-priviledges; for both are to grow in the same Field without plucking up till the Harvest.

3. In the matter of Vows and Covenants both Divine and humane, there is a sincerity or simplicity



plicity proper to the regenerate, 2 *Cor.* 1. 12. and there is a sincerity or simplicity common to the unregenerate, *Gm.* 20. 5, 6. 2 *Sam.* 15. 11. In humane Covenants, as between Husband and Wife, to covenant without common honesty and simplicity would be horrible sin. Such a Covenant so entred into, would bind; but no man ought so to covenant. In covenanting with God in Baptism and the Lords Supper I do equally conceive that there is a common simplicity or sincerity, as there is a common Faith: and that it is less displeasing to God to covenant in a common simplicity, so as by common Grace a man may, than wholly forbear. I do not think that all which swore King *Asa's* Covenant, were sincere regenerate Souls, 2 *Chron.* 15. 12, 13, 14, 15. nor all that swore the late solemn League and Covenant. The bare external Act is as acceptable to God as other religious Acts done by the same man in a common simplicity.

4. In the point about Infants, I will not say that my interpretation of 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. comes up to the full sense of those words *holy* and *unclean*. What I have said is true; but that it is the full meaning of that Text, I will not say. The state of Heathen Infants I leave to God and wiser persons than my self. I conceive that the Infants of unregenerate Christian Parents are holy, within the meaning of 1 *Cor.* 7. 14.

5. In the point concerning the distinction between Presbyters and Bishops, I am afraid I have over-done in confusing St. *Hierome* with his own words, and have gone too high in arguing from the legal Polity to the Gospel. If I have gone beyond this simple assertion, That by just and honest right, Bishops may have some more office in the Church than Presbyters; and that it is neither unlawful nor inconvenient, that there be for every Diocese or County, greater or less, as prudence shall appoint, an eminent Minister, to be *Episcopus Pastorum* in a qualified sense, and to have the charge of all the Clergy and Churches in his Diocese, as a general Superintendent or Overseer; I say if I have said more than this, I have gone beyond my self: more than this I need not assert.

6. Where I call the Independent way of Church-Covenanting a *Babel*, and say it would quickly root up all the Churches, my meaning is, That if you maintain it to be necessary by Divine

Vine Law, and practise it in its full breadth and latitude; and urge it upon all others according to the principle, it is destructive and self-ruining.

7. If any shall think me to have charged the solemn League and Covenant too deeply, for my part I am not able to defend it. Yet when I consider the multitude and piety of those which took it, and the condition the Nation then was in, I can say much towards the excusing of it *à tanto*, but not *à toto*.

8. I shall not deny but that a Troop may well be called a part of the Army, and a City of a Kingdom. But I affirm, That the Church of God at *Corinth* is a Church, and not part of a Church, whether universal or particular.

9. Where I say, *page 3.* That the Church-Canons are supposed not repugnant to Gods word, I mean it in the judgment of those who made them; and who uphold them. I neither assert *pro* nor *con* as to the Canons themselves, being they are no Law of Parliament, nor any part of Subscription.

10. I could wish I had forborn that passage out of *Cyprian*; with my application of it, *p. 137.* though the words should prove to be well. *Indistum volo.*

Some Errours committed by the Printer, I have gathered into an *Errata*.

#### ERRATA:

**I**N the Introduction, *page 5. lines 27, 28, 29. r.* If the conforming Churches will well hold all the people, and the ministry be such as a godly man may profit by. *In the Book, p. 3. l. 8. del. cæteris paribus. p. 22. l. 6. for act r. art. p. 33. l. 9. for Jurisdiction r. Discipline. p. 24. l. 26. r. quickened. p. 39. l. 23. del. either gradually or. p. 40. l. 22. r. correct. p. 60. l. 6. for quoad r. ad. p. 85. l. 10. for for r. of. p. 101. l. 25. r. receding. p. 147. l. 2. r. scorning at. p. 161. l. 31. r. conference. p. 165. l. 10. r. reverent. p. 167. l. 28, 29. r. Constitution. p. 172. l. 11. r. but L. p. 216. l. 28. for as hand r. seen. p. 172. l. 33. for a false deceitful r. ungodly. p. 186. l. 9. for adulterous r. ungodly. p. 167. l. 6, 7. for any r. such. p. 34. l. 22. for Constable r. Magistrate.*

F I N I S.

